THE

# CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXXXIX.] JULY, 1856. [Vol. XII.

## FROUDE'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND.*

A volume of Essays appeared last year by Members of the University of Oxford, among which was a remarkable one by Mr. Froude, on the best means of teaching English History. Dissatisfied with all who have written on this subject, from Hume to Hallam, as deficient either in knowledge and impartiality or in sympathy and imagination, he proposes a new mode of remedying this lamentable deficiency in our literature, the study of the Statutes at Large, as containing the only true and authentic picture of the state of the nation in successive periods. He bestows unmeasured contempt, founded, as has been shewn, in great part upon ignorance† and prejudice, on the course of historical study indicated by the examinations of the University of London; has little hope even of his own Oxford after her reform; and, in short, thinks Carlyle's Cromwell the only good book of history that has been published for an age. The Essay was evidently designed to clear the road of all the rubbish that encumbered it, and leave it open for the present work, in which the author exemplifies his own idea of the proper materials of English history, and the manner in which it should be treated.

Mr. Froude considers Carlyle to have been the first who justly appreciated the character of Oliver Cromwell. He himself aspires to perform the same service for

> "the majestic lord,
> Who broke the bonds of Rome"—

to vindicate Henry VIII. from the charge of being a bloated, sensual tyrant, a royal Bluebeard, and to claim for him not only the admiration of England, as the handsomest, the strongest, the most accomplished man of his times, but our gratitude as a sagacious statesman, a sovereign with whom the welfare of his people was the mainspring of his policy, and to whom we owe the safety of our religious liberties. This, it must be confessed, is a marvellous transformation; but we must not condemn it as the result of mere love of paradox and novelty, without hearing what Mr. Froude has to allege. At the same time, we must

* History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. By James Anthony Froude, M.A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo. London—John W. Parker and Son. 1856.

† See the National Review, No. IV. p. 342, note.

confess that we have a strong faith in that traditional character of eminent, and especially ruling, personages, which is really the verdict of the national mind. Histories are composed and published for many other purposes than to relate the truth—to vindicate or blacken a church, a party or a statesman; but the history that is written in the memory of a people, and the character that lives in their traditions and their epithets, are subject to no such perverting influences, and the more elaborate research of antiquaries seldom alters it. The popular character of Henry VIII. is that of a joyous, energetic, outspoken man, in whom some fine qualities were perverted to evil by selfishness, passion and pride. Mr. Froude must shew strong cause for setting this verdict aside. He must produce some new evidence on his client's behalf; for argument on the facts already known is completely exhausted, and along with it the patience of the court. Such evidence he professes to produce. We know how shamefully our public records have been neglected; how many have perished, how many have been mutilated; how difficult it has been to use those which have been preserved, owing to the want of arrangement, of indexes and catalogues. This state of things no longer exists. What has escaped the damp and the rats is now accessible in the Rolls' House, and Mr. Froude has availed himself of the new facilities for consulting them. He has enjoyed the further advantage of employing the materials which Sir Francis Palgrave had collected for his meditated history of this period. We do not think that these new documents have materially altered the balance of evidence on any of the disputed questions; but we are thankful for them, because till they were produced we were in danger of overrating their importance, and keeping our judgment in unnecessary suspense.

From Mr. Froude's title, his projected work, of which the volumes now before us only reach the execution of Anne Boleyn, may seem to treat of but the fragment of a period, as it does not include the entire reign of Henry VIII. It has, however, a beginning, a middle and an end within itself, since with the fall of Wolsey began that series of measures for the emancipation of England from the Papal yoke which ended in the secure establishment of the Anglican Church on its insulated basis. He has prefixed a chapter on the social condition of England in the sixteenth century, which is an expansion of the doctrine maintained in his Oxford Essay, that there was more virtue and more happiness in the nation under the system of restraint and interference with private actions and private interests which prevailed in the Tudor times, than at the present day when the ideal of legislation is a maximum of liberty and a minimum of control. The laws with which his favourite statute-book is filled, regulating the wages of labour and the prices of commodities, compelling the reluctant merchant to bring his goods to market, directing

the industry of the people into those channels which the Legislature selected, and blocking up others, prescribing the mode and materials of manufactures, and punishing adulterations—all that modern political economy cites in proof of the *un*wisdom of our ancestors, is to him an evidence of the patriotism, sagacity and self-sacrifice of the law-givers of the sixteenth century, who were content to derive smaller profits from their lands, to pay higher wages to their labourers and a higher price for what they consumed, in order to benefit the lower classes and keep them from sinking in the social scale. And the failure of these laws he attributes to the want of virtue in those who were appointed to watch over their execution. That this, however, was not owing to any gradual dwindling away of national virtue, such as he supposes the English character to have been undergoing as we have receded from the Tudor times, is evident from the rapidity with which a statute is followed by another grounded on its inefficacy. That inefficacy arose from their being in antagonism with the laws of social progress, and they have been abandoned, not because the lawgivers of the nineteenth century are indifferent to the welfare of the lower classes, but because experience has enlightened them as to the means by which their welfare is to be promoted. Mr. Froude even admires the sumptuary laws of that period, and quotes with approbation one which would make M. Soyer's hair stand on end, by which it was ordained and established that no man should be served with more than two courses, and each mess of two sorts of victuals at the utmost, whether of flesh or fish, without sauce, which however was allowed, if not too costly, on the principal feasts of the year. Our author admits that it is difficult to enforce such laws, but thinks they might have a good moral effect, because they exhibited the great persons of the realm as submitting themselves of their own free will to restrictions on their appetite. We should like to have seen some proof that the law was carried out at great men's tables, and was not, like our own Sabbath laws, a net for the flies but a cobweb for the hornets.

Mr. Froude draws a pleasing picture of England in the olden times:

"The habits of all classes were open, free and liberal. There are two expressions corresponding one to the other, which we frequently meet with in old writings, and which are used as a kind of index, marking whether the condition of things was or was not what it ought not to be. We read of 'merry England,' when England was not merry, things were not going well with it; we hear of 'the glory of hospitality,' England's pre-eminent boast,—by the rules of which all tables, from the table of the twenty-shilling freeholder to the table in the baron's hall and abbey refectory, were open at the dinner hour to all comers, without stint or reserve or question asked. To every man, according to his degree, who chose to ask for it, there was free fare and free lodging; bread, beef and beer for his dinner; for his lodging, perhaps only a mat of rushes in a

spare corner of the hall, with a billet of wood for a pillow, but freely offered and freely taken, the guest probably faring much as his host fared, neither worse nor better. There was little fear of an abuse of such licence, for suspicious characters had no leave to wander at pleasure; and for any man found at large, and unable to give a sufficient account of himself, there were the ever-ready parish stocks or town gaol. The 'glory of hospitality' lasted far down into Elizabeth's time; and then, as Camden says, 'came in great bravery of building, to the marvellous beautifying of the realm, but to the decay' of what he valued more.

"In such frank style the people lived, hating three things with all their hearts—idleness, want, and cowardice; and for the rest, carrying their hearts high and having their hands full. The hour of rising, winter and summer, was four o'clock, with breakfast at five; after which the labourers went to work, and the gentlemen to business, of which they had no little. In the country every unknown face was challenged and examined—if the account given was insufficient, he was brought before the justice; if the village shopkeeper sold bad wares, if the village cobbler made 'unhonest' shoes, if servants and masters quarrelled, all was to be looked to by the justice; there was no fear lest time should hang heavy with him. At twelve he dined; after dinner he went hunting, or to his farm, or to what he pleased. It was a life unrefined, perhaps, but coloured with a broad, rosy, English health."—I. 35—37.

A fair statement, we think, is given of the question respecting Henry's divorce from Catharine of Arragon. It was a measure, if not of absolute political necessity, at least of urgent political expediency. The nation had suffered most deeply in the wars of the Roses from a disputed succession; the Princess Mary's title might be questioned even as a female; for the right of female succession had never been formally established. Doubts had existed from the first whether the Pope's dispensation had rendered Henry's marriage with his brother's widow lawful, and the question was sure to be raised, if he left no male heir. The Countess of Salisbury had a powerful faction ready to assert her claim to the throne; James of Scotland was the next heir in blood if the Princess Mary were set aside, and in that case a Scottish invasion was to be apprehended. But from the age of Catharine, the hope of male issue by her was at an end. Could the marriage of Henry have been dissolved, like that of Napoleon and Josephine, by an act of internal legislation, all would have been easy; for Henry's parliament was fully alive to the inconvenience of the actual situation. But the sanction of the Pope was deemed necessary, and the Pope was under the control of the Emperor, Charles V., who warmly espoused the cause of his aunt. Mr. Froude follows, patiently and clearly, the progress of the question of divorce, through the labyrinth in which it was involved by the treachery and fickleness of Clement, the tortuous and uncertain policy of Francis, and the machinations of the Emperor, Charles V. The latter committed a grievous

error in politics when he endeavoured to avail himself of the dissatisfaction of the English people with Henry's treatment of the Queen, and with the attitude which he assumed towards the Church and the Pope, to excite rebellion among his subjects. The patriotic feeling of Englishmen was roused. The Emperor had boasted in the autumn of 1528, that before the winter was over he would fling Henry from the throne by the hands of his own subjects. These words were repeated by Wolsey at his own table, and a person present exclaimed, "That speech has lost the Emperor a hundred thousand hearts among us!" This strong national feeling must be borne in mind throughout the whole history, to enable us to understand the acquiescence of the people and the co-operation of parliament in measures of a violent and arbitrary character. Threatened with excommunication by the Pope, with invasion by the Imperialists, with civil war by their partizans in England, King and Parliament allowed the *salus reipublicæ* to outweigh every other consideration, and acted more like a Committee of Public Safety and a Revolutionary Tribunal than with the calmness of a legislative assembly and the impartiality of a high court of judicature.

English feeling has always done justice to Catharine of Arragon. Shakespeare has been her advocate with posterity, as her irreproachable character, her maternal misfortunes, the cruel injustice with which she was treated, were with contemporaries. Even her having been the mother of bloody Mary has not been able to extinguish sympathy. Yet we think Mr. Froude is right in regarding her as a victim of one of those fearful collisions of opposing principles and interests which occasionally occur in human affairs and crush those who stand between, rather than of the passions of an unworthy husband. The cool spectator of her history may pronounce that it would have been far better if she would have retired into a convent, renounced her royal dignity and acquiesced in Henry's second marriage; but what would this have involved? The acknowledgment, as she said, that she had been the King's harlot for twenty-four years; that her daughter was illegitimate; that the premature deaths of all her children but one was a judgment on an incestuous connection; and that the Pope had been in error in sanctioning her second marriage. And for whose sake was she to make these concessions, so humiliating to the queen, the mother, the woman and the zealous Catholic? For the sake of a husband whom she believed to have withdrawn his affections from her through fickle wantonness—of a nation among whom she was a stranger, and who were visibly tending to heresy and schism. It would be laying too heavy a burden on human nature to require from her the surrender of feelings so blameless.

Mr. Froude does not accept the common opinion that we owe

"Luther's light to Henry's lawless bed;"

and he has certainly accumulated strong reasons of policy for the divorce, by which the gage of defiance was thrown down to the Pope, and England committed to hostility with Catholic Europe. But it cannot be denied that Henry did everything in his power to justify the suspicion that he was actuated only by unworthy motives in his repudiation of Catharine and his marriage with Anne Boleyn. Mr. Froude visits him with a light censure for that which other historians have unanimously condemned in the strongest terms. He only laments that, in spite of his chivalry, his genius, his accomplishments, in his relations with women he was without delicacy. "With men he could speak the right word, he could do the right thing; with women he seemed to be under a fatal necessity of mistake." The reader, we think, will be at no loss to understand the nature of this fatal necessity. The truth is, that Henry, like another sovereign whose accomplishments procured him the title of the first gentleman in Europe, was at heart a selfish sensualist. This is patent in the whole history of the later years of his life, when his character displayed itself without disguise or restraint.

Mr. Froude has givin us, from the contemporary chronicles, a graphic description of Anne Boleyn's progress from the Tower to Westminster on the day preceding her coronation.

"On the morning of the 31st of May, the families of the London citizens were stirring early in all houses. From Temple-bar to the Tower, the streets were fresh strewed with gravel, the footpaths were railed off along the whole distance, and occupied on one side by the guilds, their workmen and apprentices, on the other by the City constables and officials in their gaudy uniforms, and 'with their staves in hand for to cause the people to keep good room and order.' Cornhill and Gracechurch-street had dressed their fronts in scarlet and crimson, in arras and tapestry, and the rich carpet-work from Persia and the East. Cheapside, to outshine her rivals, was draped even more splendidly in cloth of gold, and tissue and velvet. The sheriffs were pacing up and down on their great Flemish horses hung with liveries, and all the windows were thronged with ladies crowding to see the procession pass. At length the Tower guns opened, the grim gates rolled back, and under the archway, in the bright May sunshine, the long column began slowly to defile. Two states only permitted their representatives to grace the scene with their presence, Venice and France. It was perhaps to make the most of this isolated countenance, that the French ambassador's train formed the van of the cavalcade. Twelve French Knights came riding foremost in surcoats of blue velvet with sleeves of yellow silk, their horses trapped in blue, with white crosses powdered on their hangings. After them followed a troop of English gentlemen, two and two, and then the Knights of the Bath, 'in gowns of violet, with hoods purfled with miniver like doctors.' Next perhaps, at a little interval, the abbots passed on, mitred in their robes; the barons followed in crimson velvet, the bishops then, and then the earls and marquises, the dresses of each order increasing in elaborate gorgeousness. All these rode on in pairs. Then came alone Audeley, lord chancellor, and behind him the Venetian

ambassador and the Archbishop of York; the Archbishop of Canterbury and our old friend, Du Bellay, bishop of Bayonne, not now with bugle and hunting frock, but solemn with stole and crozier. Next the Lord Mayor, with the city mace in hand, and Garter in his coat of arms; and then Lord William Howard — Belted Will Howard, of the Scottish Border, marshal of England. The officers of the Queen's household succeeded the marshal in scarlet and gold; and the van of the procession was closed by the Duke of Suffolk, as high constable, with his silver wand. It is no easy matter to picture to ourselves the blazing trail of splendour which in such a pageant must have drawn along the London streets,—those streets which now we know so black and smoke-grimed, themselves then radiant with masses of colour, gold and crimson and violet. Yet there it was, and there the sun could shine upon it, and tens of thousands of eyes were gazing on the scene out of the crowded lattices.

"Glorious as this spectacle was, perhaps however it passed unheeded. Those eyes were watching all for another object, which now drew near. In an open space behind the constable there was seen approaching 'a white chariot' led by two palfreys in white damask which swept the ground, a golden canopy borne above it making music with silver bells. And in the chariot sat the observed of all observers, the beautiful occasion of all this glittering homage; fortune's plaything of the hour, the Queen of England—queen at last—borne along upon the waves of this sea of glory, breathing the perfumed incense of greatness, which she had risked her fair name, her delicacy, her honour, her self-respect, to win; and she had won it."—I. 432—434.

We read the description of this animated scene with very different feelings from those of the London citizens who gazed upon it. The knowledge of the subsequent melancholy history gives us a kind of Highland second sight, and the shadow of coming events casts a gloom over the picture, which to them was all brightness.

> "The bark thou saw'st yon summer morn
> So gaily part from Oban's bay,
> Mine eye beheld her, dash'd and torn,
> Far on the rocky Colonsay."

Only three years were to elapse before Anne Boleyn came forth on the green within the Tower, discrowned, attainted and divorced, to lay her head on the block. We turned with some eagerness to this part of the history, to see whether from the original documents which Mr. Froude has consulted, light could be thrown on the question of her guilt or innocence; but we have been disappointed. He has indeed emptied out before us the contents of the *Baga de Secretis* and its various pouches, but they are not more conclusive than those of other Green Bags of modern celebrity. Miss Strickland had already correctly stated the nature of these documents in her later editions, as being merely the indictment, precepts and conviction of the Queen, without a tittle of the evidence by which the charges were supported. This evidence, we must suppose, was produced

before the grand jury of Middlesex which found the indictment on which the peers condemned her; but a grand jury hears only ex-parte depositions. From the record of the proceedings in parliament, it is doubtful whether any oral testimony was heard there; it is only said that the Queen pleaded Not guilty, and that the peers, being charged by the Lord Steward to speak the truth, severally said that she was guilty. But if oral evidence were produced, we know that no counsel was allowed to a culprit, and that in a case of treason no rebutting evidence could be offered. Compare this proceeding with the Bill of Pains and Penalties against the queen of George IV., the prolonged investigation, the cross-examination of hostile witnesses, the unlimited power of producing counter evidence, the array of able advocates for the defence, and then let the reader say whether a trial conducted as was that of Anne Boleyn, though issuing in condemnation, furnishes any proof of guilt. Mr. Froude relies on the confession of Smeton and the high characters of the peers by whom she was condemned. He cannot think that the ancestors of the aristocracy of England, "the Duke of Suffolk and Sir William Fitzwilliam, the Wellington and Nelson of the sixteenth century," could have been parties to the concoction of a plot against an innocent woman. But before we can allow much force to this argument, we require not only some proof that the means of judging were afforded them, but also some reasonable ground for believing that they would not have voted against the Queen but on entire conviction of her guilt. The subsequent history of Henry's parliaments does not warrant such reliance on the moral courage of his peers. They were ready to sanction his worst acts; and every one of them must have felt that had he thwarted the King by a verdict of acquittal, his own head would have fallen some day before the vengeance of the unforgiving tyrant. Doubtless the Roman senate contained many valiant and able men; yet an Emperor could always procure the condemnation of those whom he was determined to destroy.

So thoroughgoing is Mr. Froude in his defence of Henry, that while other historians have unanimously inferred, from his marrying Jane Seymour the very day after Anne Boleyn had been beheaded, that he was in haste to get her out of the way, he sees in it a fresh proof of his anxiety to fulfil the wishes of his parliament and people that he should have male issue. Can it be doubted that this was his motive, when we find that the Privy Council and the peers petitioned him to save the country from the perils which menaced it, and take a fresh wife without an hour's delay? Henry continued to shew the same control on a later occasion over his tender feelings, where the good of his people was concerned. Like another Cato,

> huic lecti maximus usus
> Progenies: Urbi pater est, Urbique maritus.

On the very day of Jane Seymour's death, Cromwell wrote to the English ambassador at Paris that his council lived in hope that the King's highness would soon couple himself again, seeing he had framed his mind to be indifferent to the thing, and to the election of any person that should be thought meet for him. We confess this is a little too strong for our faith.

It is a principle in Mr. Froude's philosophy of history that we must accept those measures as good which were deemed good by the age which adopted them. Thus when the new crime of poisoning was introduced from Italy into England, and the Bishop of Rochester's servants died from the effects of poisoned yeast, he thinks the parliament did well to make the crime high treason, and the punishment boiling alive. So we have no reasonable ground to reproach the Catholics of the sixteenth century with persecution; they conscientiously believed it to be a duty.

"The pioneers of the new opinions had yet to win their way along a scorched and blackened path of suffering, before the State would consent to acknowledge them. We think bitterly of these things, and yet we are but quarrelling with what is inevitable from the constitution of the world. New doctrines ever gain readiest hearing among the common people; not only because the interests of the higher classes are usually in some degree connected with the maintenance of existing institutions, but because ignorance is itself a protection against the many considerations which embarrass the judgment of the educated. The value of a doctrine cannot be determined on its own apparent merits by men whose habits of mind are settled in other forms; while men of experience know well that out of the thousands of theories which rise in the fertile soil below them, it is but one here and one there which grows to maturity; and the precarious chances of possible vitality, where the opposite probabilities are so enormous, oblige them to discourage and repress opinions which threaten to disturb existing institutions, or which, by the rules of existing beliefs, imperil the souls of those who entertain them. Persecution has ceased among ourselves, because we do not any more believe that want of theoretic orthodoxy in matters of faith is necessarily fraught with the tremendous consequences which once were supposed to be attached to it. If, however, a school of Thugs were to rise among us, making murder a religious service; if they gained proselytes, and the proselytes put their teaching in execution, we should speedily begin again to persecute opinion,—such opinion not being tolerable in a Christian state. What teachers of Thuggism would appear to ourselves, the teachers of heresy actually appeared to Sir Thomas More, only being as much more hateful as the eternal death of the soul is more terrible than the single and momentary separation of it from the body. There is, I think, no just ground on which to condemn conscientious Catholics on the score of persecution, except only this: that as we are now convinced of the injustice of the persecuting laws, so among those who believed them to be just, there were some who were led by an instinctive protest of human feeling to be lenient in the execution of those laws; while others of harder nature and more narrow sympathies enforced them without reluctance, and even with exultation. The heart, when it is rightly constituted, corrects the folly of the head; and wise, good men,

even though they entertain no conscious misgiving as to the soundness of their theories, may be delivered from the worst consequences of them by trusting their more genial instincts. And thus, and thus only, are we justified in censuring those whose names figure largely in the persecuting lists. Their defence is impregnable to logic. We blame them for the absence of that humanity which is deeper than logic, and which should have taught them to refuse the conclusions of their speculative creed."—I. 154—156.

Leaving our readers to find out the difference between Protestantism and Thuggism, and along with it the flaw in Mr. Froude's argument from analogy, we will endeavour to remove the painful impression which this passage must have left, by a quotation of a different kind. He is describing Leigh and Leyton's visitation of the University of Oxford by the order of Cromwell.

"The heads of houses, as may be supposed, saw little around them which was in need of reform. A few students of high genius and high purposes had been introduced into the university, as we have seen, by Wolsey; and these had been assiduously exiled or imprisoned. All suspected books had been hunted out. There had been fagot processions in High Street, and bonfires of New Testaments at Carfax. The daily chapels, we suppose, had gone forward as usual, and the drowsy lectures on the schoolmen; while 'towardly young men' who were venturing stealthily into the perilous heresy of Greek, were eyed askance by the authorities, and taught to tremble at their temerity. All this we might have looked for; and among the authorities themselves, also, the world went forward in a very natural manner. There was comfortable living in the colleges; so comfortable, that many of the country clergy preferred Oxford and Cambridge to the monotony of their parishes, and took advantage of a clause in a late act of parliament which recognized a residence at either of the universities as an excuse for absence from tedious duties. * * These persons were not driven away by the heads of houses as the Christian brothers had been; they were welcomed rather as pleasant companions. In comfortable conservatism they had no tendencies to heresy; but only to a reasonable indulgence of their five bodily senses. Doubtless, therefore, the visitors found Oxford a pleasant place, and cruelly they marred the enjoyments of it. Like a sudden storm of rain, they dropt down into its quiet precincts. Heedless of rights of fellows and founders' bequests, of sleepy dignities and established indolences, they re-established long dormant lectures in the colleges. In a few little days (for so long only they remained) they poured new life into education. They founded fresh professorships —professorships of Polite Latin, professorships of Philosophy, Divinity, Canon Law, Natural Sciences—above all, of the dreaded Greek; confiscating funds to support them. For the old threadbare text-books, some real teaching was swiftly substituted. The idle residents were noted down, soon to be sent home by parliament to their benefices, under pain of being compelled, like all other students, to attend lectures, and in their proper persons 'keep sophisms, problems, disputations, and all other exercises of learning.' * * But the saddest vicissitude was that which befell poor Duns; Duns Scotus, the greatest of the schoolmen, the constructor of the *memoria technica* of ignorance, the ancient text-

book of *a-priori* knowledge, established for centuries the supreme despot in the Oxford lecture-rooms. 'We have set Duns in Bocardo,' says Leyton. He was thrown down from his high estate, and from being lord of the Oxford intellect, was 'made the common servant of all men;' condemned by official sentence to the lowest degradation to which book can be submitted. Some copies escaped this worst fate; but for changed uses thenceforward. The second occasion on which the visitors came to New College, they 'found the great Quadrant Court full of the leaves of Duns, the wind blowing them into every corner; and one Mr. Greenfield, a gentleman of Buckinghamshire, gathering up part of the same book-leaves, as he said, to make him sewers or blawnsheres,* to keep the deer within his wood, thereby to have the better cry with his hounds.' To such base uses all things return at last; dust unto dust, when the life has died out of them, and the living world needs their companionship no longer."—II. 414—418.

This was a genuine and effective Oxford reform, nothing like the delusive measure by which the demand of the present age for improvement there has been trifled with and evaded. Oh for one hour of Leigh and Leyton's besom!

The specimens which we have given will enable our readers to judge of Mr. Froude's work. We have been disappointed in not finding in it a larger addition to our original materials; the difference between him and his predecessors is not so much in new authorities as in new readings of the old. His opinions, however, are vigorously conceived and expressed, and the book is well calculated, by its opposition to popular notions, to stimulate reflection and research.

K.

## MACNAUGHT ON INSPIRATION.†

The volume under our notice is certainly a remarkable book as emanating from one holding, and claiming to hold with perfect consistency, the office of a clergyman in the Church of England; and we cannot wonder that it is exciting angry outcries amongst his reverend brethren around him. The author professes warm and admiring sympathy with the Rev. F. D. Maurice, though he expresses a modest unwillingness to damage the latter by seeming to identify him with his own views. In one respect he is certainly very unlike Mr. Maurice, inasmuch as he is perfectly clear, straightforward and downright. We respect and admire what we have heard of Mr. Maurice's efforts to interest and elevate working men; but we must con-

* The *formido* of the Latins, a string with feathers—in this instance scraps of paper—attached, which, waving in the wind, kept the timid deer within a prescribed limit.—Rev.

† The Doctrine of Inspiration: being an Inquiry concerning the Infallibility, Inspiration, and Authority of Holy Writ. By the Rev. John Macnaught, M.A. Oxon, Incumbent of St. Chrysostom's Church, Everton, Liverpool. Pp. 315. London—Longman. 1856.

fess that we have little pleasure or patience in reading his Theological Essays. He reminds us of Mr. Pecksniff's horse, which had wonderfully showy action without getting on. We read page after page of sounding verbiage, eloquent professions of candour, openness to conviction, recognition of difficulties, sympathy with earnestness, abhorrence of bigotry and cant, but it all seems to end without any definite or tangible result. Mr. Macnaught, on the contrary, tells us plainly enough that he considers the Bible to contain errors as to history, science, morality and religion, and that he accepts as truth only what approves itself to his own judgment and conscience. He says truly enough,

"In the materials of this book it is believed that there is nothing new. That which the writer believes to be novel, and that, consequently, which induces him to ask from the public a perusal of his book, is the combination of a tolerable freedom from bias; a fearless following of premises to their conclusions; and, after free inquiry, the candid avowal of those modified but distinct opinions regarding Inspiration which still remain in the mind of a believer and a clergyman."*

Mr. Macnaught begins by lamenting the effects of the present confused notions of Inspiration in alienating from the Church and from Christianity men of educated and logical minds;—"and so the Church loses its younger Newman, its *Theodore Parker*, and countless others, of worth perhaps as great, but names less known." We were not aware that the Church of England had ever boasted Theodore Parker amongst its adherents. There is one thing which strikes us forcibly in Mr. Macnaught's volume—that he never once alludes to the sentiments of Unitarian writers on the important questions of which he treats. Among the writers to whom reference is made he includes Coleridge, Morell, F. Newman, Froude, Theodore Parker, Strauss, and even Holyoake and Joseph Barker, but never mentions the Unitarians by name, or recognizes the fact that they alone, as a Christian sect, are for the most part in the habit of denying the very doctrine against which he contends (that of plenary and infallible inspiration), and of putting forth the very arguments on which he relies. The Unitarians have always known how to discriminate between a rational reverence for the truly divine element in the Scriptures, and a superstitious adherence to the letter. In the writings of Priestley, Belsham, Channing, Andrews Norton and Martineau, in the last two more especially, is to be found that intelligent and discriminating reverence for all that approves itself as really excellent and holy in the Scriptures, for which Mr. Macnaught contends. Professor Norton's important and elaborate Note on the Old Testament, in his work on the Genuineness of the Gospels, ought,

* P. 13.

we think, to be known to our author, and, if known, ought certainly to have been alluded to; and it is impossible to suppose that, as a Liverpool clergyman, he can be ignorant of Mr. Martineau's name, or that, writing on such topics, he can be pardonably ignorant of the Rationale of Religious Inquiry, or of the published Lectures and preliminary Correspondence of the Liverpool Unitarian Controversy. Such ignorance would be almost as culpable in its wilfulness as the only other alternative of want of candour in not acknowledging that what Unitarians have contended for, in the face of much obloquy and reproach, he himself now repeats. We do not, indeed, affirm that the older Unitarian writers distinctly laid down the broad principle at which Mr. Macnaught arrives, but it is continually implied by them, as for example in the very free criticisms by Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham on the reasoning of St. Paul; and we think we may venture to affirm that the most eminent leaders of the modern school of Unitarian thought not only virtually adopt the principle as one with which they are habitually familiar, but distinctly and formally recognize it. It is at all events notorious that, both in the Liverpool Unitarian Controversy and on other occasions, it has repeatedly and emphatically been set forth by the defenders of orthodoxy as proverbially characteristic of the Unitarians, that they deny the inspiration of the Scriptures in any sense implying an infallible freedom from error. When writers in the ranks of our theological opponents come round to the positions long maintained by a "sect everywhere spoken against," it is not, perhaps, unnatural or impolitic in them to ignore their conversion to our views, but certainly it is not fair, candid or manly.

Mr. Macnaught adopts, to begin with, the Unitarian version of 2 Tim. iii. 16, "Every divinely inspired writing is also profitable for instruction," &c. Then, passing over with a mere brief allusion the scientific impossibilities of the Old Testament, he proceeds to enumerate as conclusive against the theory of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, the undeniable discrepancies and inaccuracies in the Gospels, such as the different genealogies of Jesus and the mistaken applications of alleged prophecies. He says nothing as to the question of the genuineness of the introductory chapters of Matthew and Luke, but speaks plainly enough as to the fallibility of their contents, and as to the utter extravagance and absurdity of the shifts to which commentators have been driven in their desperate attempts to make out their consistency and credibility. In the third Chapter of his first Book (which treats of the evidence of the Scriptures themselves as to their own infallibility), after deprecating "the devices by which it is possible to fence with these errors in the history of Holy Writ," he fortifies himself with quotations from Neander, Bishop Burnet, Tholuck, Bishop Hinds, Archbishop Whately

and Bishop Hampden, as to the possibility of error in the Bible, with the exception of religious error. He then proceeds to question the admissibleness of this exception, and speaks thus honestly of the conduct of Jael:

"There had been a fierce battle between the long-oppressed but now victorious Israelites, and the discomfited hosts of Jabin, king of Hazor. Heber the Kenite was not an Israelite, and therefore was not necessarily one of the Canaanites' enemies. Nay, we are even told that 'there was peace between Jabin, the king of Hazor, and the house of Heber the Kenite.' Sisera, the captain of Jabin's host, was compelled to flee away, on foot, for his life. In the tent of the friendly Heber he was affectionately received, with all the hospitality of the East. Relying on the good faith of his hostess, Jael, Heber's wife, Sisera composed himself to sleep. Then Jael, from some motive which is not assigned, stole upon the slumbering Sisera, and slew him by driving one of the tent nails into his forehead. Shortly afterwards she shewed the smitten chief to his pursuer, Barak. This whole transaction is recorded in the Bible in language worthy of the grandest tragedy; and, moreover, an inspired prophetess, Deborah, who had foretold the manner of Sisera's death, chants the glory and the vengeance of the Canaanitish overthrow; and in this chant she recounts the deed of Jael, and sings, 'Blessed above women shall Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite, be; blessed shall she be above women in the tent.' We must leave Dr. Hampden to draw the lines of demarcation between the fallible morality and infallible religion of this history and this teaching. For ourselves, we think it perilous to attempt teaching the purest religious principles by such questionable morality without designating the deed of Jael by its true name; and we put it to every conscience which knows humanity, or has been enlightened by the New Testament, whether the true and proper name of this scripturally-approved deed be not treachery and murder most base, foul, and unnatural?"*

Our author then characterizes with equal honesty and plainness the angry imprecations of Jeremiah, the Psalmist and Paul, against their adversaries, and cites as instances of religious error the Jewish disbelief of a future life, the apostolic belief as to the time and nature of Christ's second coming, and what he calls the bad morality of Paul's doctrine in 1 Cor. xv., which, he says, seems to imply that, if there were no resurrection, the wisest thing man could do would be to seize all the selfish and sensual enjoyment he could while life lasted. It seems singular for a Church-of-England clergyman to lay so heavy a charge against so important a portion of the impressive Service for the Burial of the Dead. It is possible, however, that Paul was setting forth rather the probable result, in the generality of cases, of the disbelief of a resurrection, than advocating it as, in his own opinion, the best course to pursue. Or, as others have suggested, the apostle may have been contemplating (as Mr. Macnaught himself believes) a speedy termination of the present

* Pp. 67, 68.

state of existence altogether, in which case the denial of a resurrection would certainly leave scarcely any perceptible encouragement to take any serious interest in duty or in life, or to place any check on the passions or caprices of the moment. If the human *race* were on the point of being extinguished, with no prospect of future existence, it would be difficult to shew what inducement remained to do anything but eat and drink and die. In such circumstances to exhort men to practise virtuous self-denial, would seem almost as absurdly incongruous as the reported collection towards rebuilding a chapel when the preacher had been solemnly announcing that the world would come to an end in six weeks. This mode of vindicating the morality of the apostle's reasoning, however, is of course at the expense of his infallibility.

In his second Book, our author inquires what reason there is for expecting the Bible to be infallible. He dismisses miracles, even if admitted to be genuine, as any proof that the writers recording them, or even those who wrought them, were incapable of error. With equal conciseness he dismisses prophecies, adducing as examples the recorded and true predictions of Balaam in the Old Testament and Caiaphas in the New. He then inquires whether the Scriptures claim infallible inspiration for themselves. He shews that Jesus, in his Sermon on the Mount, abrogates some of the precepts of the Law as delivered to Moses. He explains the quotations of Jesus from Psalms lxxxii. and cx. as having been adduced merely as arguments with the Jews on their own showing, without affirming the infallibility of the Old Testament. He deprecates the notion that Jesus really adduced prophecies as proofs that men must perform certain actions because they are so ordained, especially when compared with the *conditional* character of much of the prophetic language of the Old Testament. We might ask here, however, whether Mr. Macnaught questions the power of God to foresee future events, and, if not, whether it is not possible for Him to inspire men with such knowledge, without interfering with the freedom of the human will. At all events, those who maintain the freedom of the will are not in the habit of denying the prescience of God, however difficult it may be to human reason to reconcile the two. Our author justly observes that the infallibility of the Old Testament cannot be proved from any assertions in the Old Testament, so long as the infallibility of the latter remains unproved. He denies that the Scriptures are ever, as a whole, denominated the Word of God in any passage of the Scriptures themselves. In Chapter iv. he discusses the question whether the infallibility of the Bible is proved by the impossibility of the writers ascertaining by natural means the particulars of which they write, and maintains that the evangelists, from their own showing, took natural means to acquaint themselves with the

materials of their narratives. With regard to the Pentateuch, he gives the usual proofs that it was in great measure compiled from older and fragmentary documents, and points out the duplicate and discordant accounts of the creation and the deluge. In Chapter v. he denies that the general excellence of the Bible is a necessary proof of its absolute infallibility. In Chapter vi. he considers the argument from canonicity, and asks how we know that the books of the Old Testament admitted into the Jewish canon were more sacred or authoritative than others which are alluded to by name, or than the Apocryphal writings. He remarks that we scarcely know who wrote a single book of the Old Testament. He investigates the evidence of the canonical authority of the Old Testament, and whilst admitting that it probably conforms to the Hebrew canon, he asks how that can bear the tremendous burden of inspirational infallibility. With regard to the New Testament, he observes that the Fathers quote the sayings of Jesus without professing to extract them from any of our canonical writers. He remarks that we have no evidence of the existence of our present four Gospels till the second century, that we do not know why there were only four, and that we have no evidence that their authors were Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, except the fact that those names are appended to them, whereas it is known to have been considered only an allowable and praiseworthy "pious fraud" in the early history of the church, to pass off any writing that could be useful as from the hand of an apostle. He is at a loss to know why the First Epistle of Clement and others of the Apostolic Fathers were excluded from the canon, especially as the gravest doubts were entertained as to the canonicity of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, the Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third of John, and the Revelation. Here, however, we feel disposed to remark, that this scrupulousness about admitting these books seems to shew that great care was exercised by the church in ascertaining the genuineness and excellence of books before admitting them into the sacred list, especially as the books admitted, besides being immeasurably superior to most of what is extant among the rejected books, are by no means favourable to the assumption of ecclesiastical power. With regard to the denunciation at the close of the Revelation against adding to or taking away from "the words of the book of this prophecy," he very justly remarks that this can only apply to wilful distortion or perversion of the words of this particular book, and reminds the reader of the similar passage in Deut. iv. 2. He rather surprises us, however, by calling it the *popular* notion that the Revelation is one of the *earliest* of the New-Testament writings. He may be right in regarding it as not the latest, but we were under the impression that the *popular* notion was that it was composed by the evangelist John in

his old age, while an exile in the island of Patmos; and this is, at all events, a tradition on the subject. In Chapter vii. he inquires as to the promises by which Jesus is supposed to have guaranteed the inspirational infallibility of the New Testament. With regard to the assurances to his twelve apostles, when they should be brought before magistrates and kings, "it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak; for it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you,"—he asks, if this is to be taken as an argument for their infallibility, how it was that they long remained ignorant of the plain meaning of the terms in which Jesus foretold his own death. He adduces the case of Stephen, and shews that Stephen was so far from being infallible, that his statement contradicted the statements in the book of Genesis as to the history of Abraham and his descendants, and remarks that it must be admitted that either the Old Testament or Stephen or the writer of the Acts of the Apostles must have been in error, any one of which admissions would be incompatible with the theory of the inspirational infallibility of the whole of the Bible. With regard to the other commissions of Jesus to the chosen twelve, Mr. Macnaught reminds us of the fallibility of Peter, and of his being withstood by Paul to the face "because he was to be blamed." The prayer of Jesus for his disciples (John xvii.) our author understands as applicable to all his believers of every age, and he calls attention to the fact that the special office of the Spirit in their case was simply to recall to their remembrance the things which Jesus had said to them, when his crucifixion had dissipated their Jewish expectations of a temporal deliverer. In Chapter viii. he considers the argument from the supposed perfection of everything proceeding from God, and shews how inapplicable this would be to the unquestionable blemishes and imperfections of his creatures in the natural world, which must, equally with the Scriptures themselves, be supposed to come from God. In Chapter ix. he answers the *à-priori* argument by asking if it is not probable, *à priori*, that God would preclude the existence of sin, and by shewing in other instances how precarious *à-priori* arguments are. In Chapter x. he considers the *à-posteriori* argument for the infallibility of the Scriptures—the argument, namely, that, if their infallibility be not maintained, we have no proof of the resurrection of the body or of the immortality of the soul, no certainty as to what Christ taught or God would have us to do. He postpones a full answer to this allegation to a subsequent portion of his volume, but in the mean time reminds his readers that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Bible does not prevent the greatest diversity of opinion and interpretation, and even the existence of much unbelief; and he very properly maintains that, whatever may be the apparent consequences, we must not "lie for God," we must not uphold what

is untrue for the sake of any supposed good that is to result. Such a course really implies a want of faith in God. He asks what would have been the state of the world if Jesus and all other great reformers had been deterred from their work by the consideration of the immediate consequences. In Chapter xi. he recapitulates the contents of the Book, and asks if the works of great writers are devoid of value because they are not infallible.

In Book iii. he inquires into the true meaning of the inspiration which he believes really to attach to the Bible. He discusses the Hebrew and Greek terms for breath or spirit, and shews the variety of application they receive. He shews how the Hebrews regarded the spirit of God as animating everything in nature. As regards man more especially, he adduces the inspiration of Bezaleel to execute the work of the tabernacle, of judges to assist Moses, of Gideon, Jephthah and David, to fight, &c. In like manner, in the New Testament, he maintains that every good thing is referred to the inspiration of God. The Old-Testament idea of inspiration is carried out in the New Testament, the inspiration of which is the same in kind, but fuller in degree. The novelty of the miraculous powers imparted on the day of Pentecost lay, not in their nature, but in the extent of their communication. It is remarkable that the Scripture writers themselves never pronounce their own writings to be inspired. The expression of Paul, "I think also I have the spirit of God," our author refers to a degree of doubt in the apostle's mind, as to whether the wisdom, utility or holiness of the thought in question were sufficient to characterize it as peculiarly divine. The following sentence briefly and clearly expresses the author's views as to the nature of inspiration:

"— this which we have written, seems to us to be the Bible's own teaching on the subject of Inspiration, namely, that everything good in any book, person or thing, is inspired, and that the value of any inspired book must be decided by the extent of its inspiration and the importance of the truths which it well (or inspiredly) teaches. Milton and Shakspeare and Bacon and Canticles and the Apocalypse and the Sermon on the Mount and the eighth chapter to the Romans are—in our estimation—all inspired; but which of them is the most valuable inspired document, or whether the Bible, as a whole, is not incomparably more precious than any other book, these are questions which must be decided by examining the observable character and tendency of each book, and the beneficial effect which history may shew that each has produced."*

In Book iv. the author treats of the just authority of Holy Writ, deprecating any extreme reaction from receiving it with implicit reverence as infallible, to regarding it with disrespect as worthless. He enumerates the claims of the Bible to reverent attention;—its antiquity, as a collection of writings treasured and held sacred by many generations of men; the fact that it is

* P. 192.

the only book in which we can find recorded the origin and early growth of Christianity, that religion which made its way in opposition to the most vehement hostility and the most contemptuous scorn of the powerful of the earth. He dwells on the differences and controversies which have prevailed among Christians from the times of the Fathers downwards; and in speaking of the difficulty of ascertaining how much of their various doctrines was derived from primitive Christianity and how much from their own speculations, he uses words very significant from a member of a Church so rigidly orthodox as the Church of England, in its Creeds and Articles, claims to be.

"This is a great problem. On the theory of modern Christendom—the theory, namely, that eternal bliss, or eternal damnation, depends, in the case of every individual, to a great extent, if not wholly, on each man's holding the orthodox creed in all its parts—it is a tremendous problem. But, apart from the specific interests of Christianity, this is evidently a great, an important and an interesting question."*

He explains the origin and success of Islamism and Mormonism by the fiery enthusiasm and sagacious cunning of their respective founders, and by the selfish and sensual passions to which they appealed; but as to the secret power of Christianity, we should have no clue without the Scriptures of the New Testament. In Chapter iii. he adds some special considerations; first, that the Bible has given the impulse to modern civilization. He contrasts the progress of the countries in which the Bible has been freely made known, with those in which it has been a sealed book—the rapid strides of Germany, England and Scotland, as compared with Italy and Spain, quoting Macaulay's well-known passage in the first volume of his History. Secondly, he contrasts the English with the French Revolution, ascribing the difference to the influence of the Bible in the former case and its absence in the latter. Thirdly, he characterizes the charitable and missionary enterprizes of the last half-century as emanating from the influence of the Bible,—paying a tribute to the energy and zeal of the Evangelical party, "however we may protest against and deplore their egregious errors." On these grounds he vindicates the true authority to which the Bible is entitled. If the order of proceeding be reversed, and the reader be told first to accept the Bible as infallible, then its authority becomes insecure. He quotes from Archbishop Whately's "Search after Infallibility," addressed to Papists, and applies his argument to the supposed infallibility of the Bible. He further vindicates the true authority of the Bible by comparing it with the best excellences of the most civilized heathen religion. He does full justice to the Socratic philosophy, but deprecates Plato's exclusion of poetry from his ideal republic, the counte-

* Pp. 214, 215.

nance given by Socrates to the childish superstitions of his day, the absence of worthy views as to the proper dignity of woman, and his indifference to the propagation and diffusion of what he considered to be important truth. With regard to the alleged faults of the Bible, our author maintains that whatever is bad is condemned in the best passages of the Bible itself. In the second section of this chapter he praises the Bible for its eclectic character. In the following passage we think we can trace the influence of Mr. Martineau's writings, though he is never mentioned by name:

"Of course it will be easy for theologians to bring forward texts, spoken by Paul and others, when they were using every possible means to carry conviction on any subject and to persuade men's minds—texts, spoken or written under such circumstances, in which *authority*, in common with every possible topic that could be made available for persuasion, is made use of. But, against all such attempts to assert or enforce teaching on authority, we put it to the thoughtful mind whether precepts, like those at the head of this paragraph,* are not in their very nature paramount and supreme—whether there is not in the human mind such a divinely constituted nature that the moment you appeal to man's consciousness, his inner sense of right and wrong, his own power of judgment, of self and for self, is his prerogative inalienable, his responsibility inevitable? Only once say, home to a man's heart and understanding, You are your own judge: God's vicegerent conscience is within you: *Judge for yourself*—once say this so that a man shall hear it, and he is for ever afterwards God's freeman. You may, by *reason*, convince his judgment and so convert or change his views; but by *authority*, of priest or church or book, you can never again guide his mind. Though he were a slave before, he has touched the English shore and he is free, and, with his emancipation, he must take charge of himself."†

In Section 3 it is affirmed, as another characteristic excellence of the Bible, that it teaches that God is everywhere acting; in Section 4, that it teaches that God is love.

"From what other book but the Bible is it that we learn the grand mystery, which, when taught, is so simple and so perceptible a truth, that God is love, and that, if at any time He should appear to us otherwise than, in His very essence, Love—if at any time He should appear to us as a jealous or a terrible God, or as a consuming fire—it is not because He has changed His nature: but because we are viewing Him through the various media of our different sins and our chilling sense of guilt. The child, whose disobedience is as yet only known to himself, looks at his loving parent with a vastly different association of ideas from those which, ere he had transgressed, lighted up the eye with joy as it met a father's smile. Even so, let man, in innocence or in the undoubting assurance of pardon, look at God, and he will see that his heavenly Father is love."‡

This is beautifully said, but a Unitarian would have given still

* 1 Thess. v. 21; 1 Cor. x. 15; Phil. iv. 8; 1 Pet. iii. 15; 1 John iv. 1.
† Pp. 261, 262. ‡ P. 265.

greater prominence to this affecting exhibition of God in the aspect of a Father, as a striking and peculiar excellence of the Christian Scriptures.

In Section 5, the concrete exemplification in which the style of Scripture so largely consists, is pointed out as admirably adapted to render it popular and effective. How graphic, he observes, is the teaching of the Bible! In Section 6 he points out the wise aim of the Bible to work a gradual reform in the individual conscience and heart, rather than a sudden and violent revolution in the outward forms of society, and speaks of this tolerance as a peculiar excellence.

"The Bible does not come into a Popish country and produce revolution by ordering outward insults to the established usages. Even in the Old Testament there is a striking instance of this, in the indulgence, which appears to have been asked and not refused to Naaman, with reference to accompanying his master into the temple of Nisroch. Thus the Sacred Scriptures do not enjoin rebellious iconoclasm in order to remove idolatry: neither does the Bible command sudden and baneful* emancipation in a slaveholding country. Indeed, in whatever outward circumstances the Bible finds a man or a people whom it converts, in the same it would have them continue till the slave, by Christian industry, wisdom and thrift, can purchase his freedom; or till, in any case, the outward position and circumstances are raised and improved as an effect or result attending the mental or internal improvement of the individual or the multitude. In a word, the Bible, as a Reformer, is no revolutionist. It works on the heart and mind first; and then, certainly, though gradually and in an orderly development, the outward carriage, the countenance, the whole man or the whole society is ameliorated. For this its power of reforming peacefully, by slowly leavening whole kingdoms with its loving principles, we reverence the wisdom of the Bible and are prepared to respect its authority."†

In Section 7 he speaks of the change of heart required in the Bible, and its offers of pardon and acceptance to every repenting sinner. Section 8 exhibits the consummate knowledge of man characteristic of the Bible, disclaiming for it, however, any literally *prophetic* character. Section 9 instances its beautiful declarations of the universal brotherhood of man. In this section the author contends strongly that the Bible maintains man's power of doing something for himself; the Spirit of God only works with him, and is ever ready to work with him. Section 11 treats of the language of Scripture on the subject of prayer. The Bible, says the author, teaches that God, indeed, cannot be changed by prayer, but that a change may be wrought in the mind of him who offers the prayer, so as to bring him into a new moral position. Mr. Macnaught seems to believe that this

* The word "baneful" begs the question as to whether the immediate emancipation of slaves may not be beneficial to them, as well as a Christian duty on the part of their masters.

† Pp. 271, 272.

is all that prayer can do. He does not take notice of the hypothesis that prayer, and the state of mind consequent upon it, may be a necessary condition on which alone certain blessings will be granted by God. If the whole effect of prayer were believed to be its natural effect on the mind of the offerer (like the effect of attention or meditation), we cannot but think that the practice of individual prayer, *as* prayer, in the sense of an earnest, heartfelt asking of God, would altogether cease. It would be felt to be an unreal, artificial form. Section 12 dwells on the scriptural doctrine of the possibility of individual communion with God. The Bible teaches that God is everywhere present in spirit with every one of His children.

In Book v. our author considers the bearing of his views on Christian believers and Christian ministers; and here for the first time occurs a symptom of possible difference with Unitarians. He says that his view of inspiration is compatible with belief in the Trinity. But what does he mean by belief in the Trinity?

"A man may believe Scripture to be fallible, and yet he may—as we ourselves do—believe Jesus to be the anointed Son of God, who came into the world and lived and died and rose again, in order that we might learn through him to trust and love God our heavenly Father, and so loving and trusting Him might be and be accounted righteous. One may be assured that there are errors in Holy Writ, and yet may believe —as we do and as all pious Jews and Christians have done—that man can do nothing, either physical, intellectual or spiritual, without the aid and upholding grace of the Holy Ghost."*

In the above statement of Mr. Macnaught's creed on the subject of the Trinity, there is nothing that a Unitarian might not adopt. This is surely very different from maintaining, with the Athanasian Creed, that "there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost," and that "the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God: And yet they are not three Gods, but one God." Our author proceeds to accept the doctrine of the miraculous conception as not more impossible than any other miracle, and as appropriate to the unique character of the mission of Christ. From such passages as the following, it may appear to some of our readers that the author sometimes applies his eclectic principle a little hastily.

"We believe these grand and Christianly consistent points whilst we gravely, though humbly, think it possible for a good Christian to doubt whether the evangelists were not misled by their own angry recollections, or by the error of such traditions as Luke tells us he followed, when—of Him, who said 'Bless, and curse not,' and of whom it is recorded that He reviled not even when He was reviled, and, again, that He gently prayed for his crucifiers, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do'—when of Him they say that he blasted a fig-tree with

* P. 290.

his curse because, as is specially recorded, it had no figs on it when 'the time of figs was not yet' *(vide* Mark xi. 13)—when of our blessed Lord they say that He caused swine to be needlessly and uselessly destroyed in thousands, that He upset the tables of the money-changers and drove men out of the precincts of the temple with a scourge, and that He designated the rulers of his country 'foxes,' 'hypocrites' and a 'generation of vipers.'"*

In Section 3, he contends that there is no impiety in disbelieving what is morally contradictory, any more than what is physically contradictory. In Chapter ii. he declares that he does not deny the Inspiration of the Bible in the true and proper sense of the word, and reminds those clergymen who may think his views inconsistent with the formularies of the Church, that Jesus did not withdraw from communion with the Jews, though he differed widely from their teaching. To the last he taught publicly in their temples and synagogues, and took part in their religious festivals. Hence Mr. Macnaught reasons that he himself is perfectly justified by the example of Christ, even though he differ from the teaching of his Church, in clinging to his office as one of her ministers until he is turned out by those above him, that the sin of schism may rest with them and not with him. This reasoning seems to us fallacious. Jesus held no ecclesiastical appointment, no salaried office among the Jews. He was not a priest, but an independent religious reformer. He addressed the people in their public assemblies as a believer in God addressing his fellow-men. He did not attach himself to one religious party among the Jews more than to another. For a man to hold preferment in the Established Church, to receive her wages, to eat her bread, whilst he is contradicting her doctrines and setting her authority at naught, seems to us neither so honest nor so likely to promote the cause of truth, as to cease to be identified with that particular denomination of Christians, and to steer an independent course. It must be borne in mind that the Established Church is only one out of many Christian churches amongst us. It is not as if the whole people (like the Jews in the time of Christ) were of one church. To leave the Established Church, therefore, is not necessarily to cease to be in communion with Christians. At all events, for a man who differs from the teaching of his Church to cease to receive wages as one of her appointed teachers, is the only course that seems to be above all suspicion of mercenary motives. In Chapter iii., however, Mr. Macnaught maintains that the law and the formularies of the Church of England do not condemn his views, and examines successively the law against blasphemy, the Act of Uniformity, and the Creeds, Ordinal, Liturgy and Articles of the Book of Common Prayer; in none of which does he find

* P. 292.

anything condemnatory of his doctrine as to Inspiration. With regard to the Homilies, he shews that they characterize some of the Apocryphal books as "infallible and undeceivable," a position which the members of his Church generally, he says, hold to be untrue, and expressly contrary to Article vi. We must confess that our author's way of reconciling his sentiments with the Articles of his Church, strikes us as rather too ingenious, not to say slippery. For example, Article viii. affirms that the three Creeds "ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture." "To this," says our author, "we heartily assent; *for* whatsoever we read in Scripture we are prepared to receive respectfully and judge reverently: whatsoever can be *proved* by any means, drawn from any source, we are ready to believe: and, above all, whatsoever can be proved by the most satisfactory evidence of the Scriptures, *that* we shall assuredly not be slow devoutly to believe." But this is not saying that he believes that the three Creeds can be so proved. He admits only the general proposition. Article xvii. declares at the close that "we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be *generally* set forth to us in holy Scripture." "Is not this," asks our author, "the very principle of Eclecticism for which we contend as a prime excellence in the Bible?" Mr. Macnaught takes the liberty of introducing the same useful word "generally," as necessarily to be presumed, in other Articles. After quoting Article vi., "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation," &c., our author proceeds: "Thus to say that all the essential articles of Christian faith are contained in the Bible is altogether different from saying that all statements contained in the Bible are essential articles of Christian faith. The former assertion, which is put forth in the sixth Article, we thoroughly believe. The latter idea, which is not to be found in any part of the Book of Common Prayer, we reject." Our author does not say how he would deal with Article vii., "The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ. Wherefore they are not to be heard which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises." Yet among our author's proofs of the fallibility of the Old Testament he alleges its incongruities with Christian principles and its non-recognition of a life to come. The assertion of Article x., that man "cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works, to faith, and calling upon God," seems to us to contradict what Mr. Macnaught lays down in the course of his book. And what could he make of Article xx., which affirms, as to the Church, "neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another"? In short, though Mr. Macnaught may make out that his doctrine of Inspiration is nowhere

expressly condemned in the Book of Common Prayer, inasmuch as it was never contemplated by its compilers, we cannot believe that they recognized the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, as anything less than the infallible teaching of God's Word.

But our author's doctrine opens much wider questions than that of conformity with the Book of Common Prayer. If we are to recognize the inspiration of God only in what approves itself to our own consciousness as excellent and holy, this very hypothesis contradicts, as we have already shewn, the orthodox notion that human nature is utterly corrupt and vile. If man's power of appreciating spiritual excellence is to be trusted as the only needful and the only possible test of inspiration from God, man cannot be by nature so wholly reprobate as most divines seem to take delight in representing him. Again, if we are to accept as inspired only what approves itself to our own sense of what is true and holy and good, what becomes of the self-contradictory doctrine of the Trinity in Unity and the divine and human natures in Christ—of the doctrine that a merciful Father had condemned the human race, for Adam's transgression, to eternal woe, but that His justice was satisfied by the substitution of His innocent and holy Son—and of the doctrine that faith in this atonement renders the worst of sinners at once acceptable to God, while the absence of such faith will leave the best and most devout of men exposed to the torments of hell-fire for ever?

Mr. Macnaught incidentally rejects the doctrine of eternal misery, as answering no conceivable end and irreconcilable with the idea of Divine mercy. Indeed, throughout his book, he continually advances the most humane and intelligent sentiments, expressed with a quiet good sense and *naïveté*, reminding us of the extemporized political opinions of the good Colonel Newcome at his election, as though quite unconscious of the *shibboleths* of his party. The great principle for which he contends strikes us as perfectly sound and highly important, though capable, no doubt, of a hasty and mistaken application. We fully concur with him that no alleged evidence of infallibility could rationally outweigh the clear decision of a healthy and intelligent conscience, and, consequently, that our only available test of the highest inspiration is its self-approval to our inmost souls. There is need, however, of care always to ascertain the whole bearing and relations of a principle or precept, before undertaking to pronounce as to its quality. Our spiritual faculties must be exercised by training and experience before they can become competent to judge truly between good and evil.

In conclusion, we have only to express our conviction that Mr. Macnaught's book is remarkably fearless, open and frank, and calculated to do great good. We think we can detect the healthy influence of his freedom of thought on his own mind, as though

he had emerged from heated college rooms into the fresh, pure air of God. We fear he will scarcely be permitted to retain his freedom together with his preferment in the Church; and we must say, if there be no good reason why he should come *out* of that Church, we can at present see none why Unitarians should not go *in*.

J. R.

---

## MAURICE'S THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS.*

THOUGH so long after date, we wish to invite the attention of our readers to the "new Preface" advertised below, in pursuance of our main object in the review of "Kingsley's Sermons for the Times," which appeared in our last number,—that we may expose yet farther the looseness of individual thought and subservience to established creeds which characterize another of the acknowledged leaders of the BROAD-CHURCH party, and against which the real friends of Christian truth and freedom cannot be too sedulously on their guard.

This Preface at its very commencement sends us to the criticism of these Theological Essays on their first publication which appeared in the Prospective Review for 1853. We have accordingly read again that very masterly criticism, which beginning (as we noted in the margin of our copy when it first appeared) with a strain of eulogy which appeared to us somewhat exaggerated, terminates with a most complete exposure of Mr. Maurice's actual position, and of the sad influence which his bondage to a creed continually exerts, whether consciously or unconsciously, on a naturally pure and earnest spirit of faith, a naturally large and generous heart. We cannot congratulate Mr. Maurice on the carping, paradoxical and oracular style or mixture of styles in which he labours in this Preface to defend himself from the severe but just strictures which his former very dogmatic appeal or remonstrance addressed to the Unitarians had called forth from one of that much misrepresented sect.

The Preface opens with a disclaimer which, in the connection in which it stands, is simply ridiculous,—a disclaimer of the "art of convincing." Mr. Maurice does not know whether there is such an art, or whether, if there be, he should wish to exercise it if he had it. And yet at the close of this very paragraph he professes that his object in writing the Essays was to *shew* both Unitarians and Trinitarians, "who are not very mature in their convictions, not very settled in their belief—that God has

* Theological Essays. By Frederick Denison Maurice, M.A. Second Edition, with a new Preface and other Additions. Cambridge—Macmillan and Co. 1853.

laid a foundation for them and for me on which we may stand together." Now how can Mr. M. *shew* this otherwise than by convincing those whom he addresses that it is as he represents—by exercising, therefore, to the best of his ability, "the art of convincing"? But so it is, that being terribly worsted in argument, he in effect cries out with the mystical dogmatist of old who could not bear to have light thrown upon *his* bats and owls any more than Mr. Maurice can on his, "O Argument, Argument, the Lord rebuke thee!"

This is paragraph the first (p. xi); and in paragraph the second (p. xii) we have another notable specimen of the same "miserable juggling"—(to borrow the Prospective reviewer's most accurate and effective phrase)—which stands instead, as it seems to us, of that just and rational "art of convincing" which Mr. Maurice, with a wise prescience, repudiates in this most important connection. The "juggling" consists in putting the readers of his Preface upon quite a wrong scent with reference to the article of review to which he had referred. That article was written as a review of Mr. Maurice's Essays. Mr. Maurice would send his readers to it as containing "the latest message of the new Unitarian school;" as affording an answer to the inquiry, "what Gospel they (the Unitarians) have to bring to mankind." On that issue Mr. Maurice professes himself willing to put their creed and his own. Very likely. But then that is not at all the issue which Mr. M.'s volume originally challenged. It contained "thoughts" which he professes in his advertisement had been "working in his mind for years," and the publication of which he hopes "may be the means of leading some to a far higher knowledge than their guide had ever attained" (p. ix). The business of the reviewer was to examine these "thoughts," and to exhibit their real character and value. Most ably did he execute his task; and it is sheer "juggling" to attempt to evade the force of his criticism by adroitly substituting a different purpose for the one actually accomplished.

Paragraph the third (p. xii), commencing with a modest disclaimer of the reviewer's compliments (in which we are not disposed to question either the sincerity or the self-knowledge of the author), goes on to notice the charge of "miserable juggling" advanced by the reviewer, who ascribes this "juggling" (as we unhesitatingly do ourselves) to the *constrained* defence of certain articles of faith to which Mr. Maurice, as a clergyman, is pledged by his ordination vows. How is this charge met? By the bold assumption to which men, beaten in fair argument, often have recourse rather than relinquish their position. "I *know* (says Mr. M.) that the Creed which leads me, as the reviewer thinks, to contradict my better nature, gives me an interest in my fellows, a sympathy with mankind, which I have not naturally, and which I find it exceedingly hard to maintain. I

know that that Creed has led me to desire truth in my inward parts, and to resist those tendencies to 'juggling' and trickery into which the reviewer supposes that it tempts me" (p. xiii). *Possibly* very true; but how very oracular!—how very impertinent to the matter in hand, which is not what Mr. Maurice *knows*, but what he *shews;* what he can set forth and maintain with intelligible and adequate argument; not what he can merely, however solemnly, asseverate.

Perhaps the paragraph immediately following (p. xiv) may have been designed to exhibit such *argument.* It is really a defence of subscription to fixed Articles; and, in a foot-note, Mr. M. refers us to a book of his, published at Oxford in 1835, and the first book which he wrote after he took orders, entitled, "Subscription no Bondage; or, the Thirty-nine Articles Guides in Academic Education." We have not this book at hand, nor is it at all necessary for us to read it in this connection, as the writer avows that he has changed some of the opinions therein expressed, among which (by implication at least) is *the opinion in favour of subscription itself*—the very substance of the book; for we read, "I would not impose our Articles upon the students in our Universities, because I see that by doing so we tempt them to dishonesty, and lead them to dislike a document which I believe they ought to love" (p. xv). Very good; but what then becomes of your "Subscription no Bondage"?—and where is the use of any "Subscription" at all? All the rest of this paragraph is totally irrelevant to the matter of Articles *as they really stand in relation to the Church of England,*—the only relation in which Mr. Maurice and his reviewer are at all concerned with them. Who doubts the propriety and use of elementary manuals of instruction, in some form or other, in religion as well as in philosophy? Who doubts that we are bound to teach what we deem the great truths of *religion* to our children, as carefully at least as the great truths of *science?* But what is the bearing of these concessions on the Articles of the Church of England?—Articles which are *imposed* upon every member of that Church,—Articles which Mr. Maurice is *bound* to hold, not simply (as he would insinuate) by his own conviction of their essential truth, but by the tyranny of an ecclesiastical Establishment? What a sad confounding of contrasted conditions have we here!—the conditions of spiritual *freedom* with those of spiritual *bondage*—as though there were no real difference between them! We presume not at all to judge Mr. Maurice's *motives,* nor do we intend either covertly to insinuate or openly to proclaim any doubt of his sincerity; but we take up the word of the reviewer as applicable to this Preface not less than to those portions of the Essays upon which it was originally pronounced as *a most just and solemn judgment,* and we say of the paragraphs now under consideration, as we have al-

ready said of some before them, "the whole argument is *miserable juggling*." Mr. Maurice's unconsciousness of the "juggling" is but the strongest possible proof of the position which both his former and his present reviewer unite to maintain.

It is not our intention to extend our remarks any further. The purpose of those which we have made is to do what we can to expose and counteract the mischievous confusion which so widely prevails in the present age from the vain and sinful endeavour to reconcile conditions essentially incompatible with, nay even opposed to, each other. Men are not willing, in the affairs of Christian faith and duty, to "choose whom they will serve." They are all of them *transcendently* religious, no doubt; but *whom* they worship, or *what* they believe, and on what grounds, they neither know nor care to inquire; unless when (as in the instance of Mr. Maurice and other members of the *Broad Church*) they can put forth what *looks like* a defence of the Established Church and Creed. No wonder that unbelief is wide-spreading, and that priests and prelates lose no opportunity of exalting their anti-christian and antiquated functions by encroaching on the just rights and innocent enjoyments of the labouring classes of the people. May the people be aroused, by such aggression, to a due regard for their spiritual rights and liberties! The *greatest need* of this age is *serious and exact thinking*: its *greatest curse*, the "*loose thoughts for loose thinkers*," which the champions of the *Broad Church* are ever so ready to furnish. We commend the "Preface" on which we have been animadverting to the attention of our readers, as affording another striking example of "loose thinking," and of some of the practical evils which result from it.

---

## JOWETT ON THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL.*

Mr. Jowett's book is that rarest of all literary phenomena, an original work on a theological subject. There are sufficient reasons why such productions should be rare. Not many men are bold enough to think out of the common ruts of ecclesiastical speculation; fewer still combine the necessary courage with the soberness of mind which in this field, if anywhere, is needed to produce valuable result; fewest of all are able to divest themselves of the associations of controversy, and to bring to the study of the Scriptures faculties really unbiassed by the necessities of an already received theory. Mr. Jowett remarks (II. 451): "It has been said (and the remark admits of a peculiar application to

* The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans. With Critical Notes and Dissertations. By Benjamin Jowett, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College, Oxford. 2 Vols. London. 1855.

theology) that few persons know sufficient of things to be able to say whether disputes are merely verbal or not." He has here characterized the originality of his own book. With a freedom from doctrinal prepossession which, considering the circumstances under which he writes, is not less than marvellous, he has gone directly to the sources of Christian faith, and bringing his own mind into absolute contact with the mind of St. Paul, has produced a picture of the faith of the early church, the vivid simplicity of which is a strong commendation of its accuracy.

Our object in the present article is not to lay before the readers of the Christian Reformer our own lucubrations on Paul and Pauline Christianity, but to give them such an account of a very remarkable book as may perhaps stimulate them to its further study. We shall, however, add to our analysis of its contents a few remarks upon Mr. Jowett's theological position as a dignitary of the English Church and a teacher in the University of Oxford.

The work before us, then, may be considered as consisting of two parts. The first is made up of the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Galatians and Romans, in the Greek text of Lachmann, with a translation, differing only where absolutely necessary from the Authorized Version, printed upon the opposite page, and accompanied by a copious commentary in the shape of foot-notes. The second and, except to the student of New-Testament Scripture, the most important portion, consists of numerous dissertations upon points of theological doctrine naturally suggested by the Epistles under consideration. It is here perhaps that the outspeaking character of Mr. Jowett's mind is most conspicuous. He might have presented the Christian world with a most valuable commentary on these four important Epistles, without incurring the sure imputation of heresy by the publication of essays, in our view so admirable, as those on the Atonement and Justification by Faith. Another distinguished ornament of the same University, Mr. A. P. Stanley, has just followed this course in his excellent work on the Epistles to the Corinthians. His theological tendencies are the same as Mr. Jowett's, and are not concealed whenever the necessities of exposition demand their display. But the whole of Mr. Jowett's book appears to us in the light of a theological manifesto, for the pronunciation of which his exposition of St. Paul's Epistles is regarded as a convenient opportunity. He has travailed of these thoughts during the whole of his religious life. He can plainly adopt the words of the psalmist,—"My heart was hot within me; while I was musing, the fire burned; then spake I with my tongue." It appears to him as if it would be treason to his deepest convictions to come so near these things, as he must needs do in expounding Paul, and yet be silent concerning them. And so, in a somewhat unsystematic form, we have in these dissertations his whole testimony respecting the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

With regard to the text of the Epistles and the commentary upon it, our remarks will be very brief. We do not profess a sufficient acquaintance with the minutiæ of New-Testament criticism to be able satisfactorily to pass a judgment upon Mr. Jowett's treatment of obscure passages and doubtful renderings. Nor would such verbal disquisition, though important enough to the biblical student, engage the attention of the majority of those who may possibly peruse these pages. We may, however, express a feeling of something like regret that Mr. Jowett adheres with so implicit a faithfulness to the text of Lachmann. It is not that, individually, we prefer any other text; that we wish to go back to the text as amended by the diligence of Griesbach; or are so ambitious of novelty as to accept without question the latest researches of Tischendorf. But we confess that it does appear to us a matter to be deprecated, that so distinguished a scholar as Mr. Jowett, who since the publication of this work has been elevated to the position of Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford, should abdicate his own judgment in this respect in favour of any other critic, however learned and impartial. The slightest intimation that Mr. Jowett had exercised his own critical powers on those passages in which Lachmann differs from other not less weighty authorities, would in our view have greatly added to the value of the expository portion of his work.

We notice that by critics who claim to speak with more authority than we can pretend to, great fault has been found with Mr. Jowett's principles of translation and exposition. He does not properly preserve the antithesis of μεν and δε; he asserts that St. Paul did not always observe the classical distinction between εἰς and ἐν. He seems to suppose that a writer immediately influenced by the Spirit of God had nevertheless great difficulty in always expressing his precise meaning; that he often qualified one clause of a sentence by another; nay, that sometimes he seems to alternate between conflicting statements, leaving his readers to gather from both an average of truth. These and other similar accusations will, we think, in the general, only tend to heighten the opinion entertained of Mr. Jowett's method by all who have studied the character of Paul's writings and the peculiarities of Hellenistic Greek. To take the latter part of the subject first: it is plain that in the Greek of the New Testament we have to deal with some very peculiar phases of the phenomena of language. The groundwork is no doubt the language of Plato and Xenophon; but intermingled with how many foreign elements? Certainly the Aramaic or new Hebrew idiom, and the philosophical language which had grown up in the schools of Alexandria, and perhaps, in the case immediately before us, something of a Cilician patois. Who shall say how far the Greek was to St. Paul a mother tongue, a language of the nursery, or

a matter of acquisition in later life? Who shall say whether he derived his knowledge of the language from the study of its Attic masters, or from the conversational corruptions, the mixed Lingua Franca, which has always been current in the Levant? How far did he write it as a foreigner—how far as a native? And the difficulties suggested by these questions are all complicated by the further consideration that the language of the New Testament is in great measure peculiar to itself, and that to compare it with itself is the only way to the elucidation of its obscurities. We have a confidence that a thorough knowledge of the construction of the Greek language, aided by a comparison of similar difficulties in other classical writers, will in the end conduct us to the thought which Plato or Aristotle have veiled in their most enigmatical phrase. But it appears to us that a wider latitude of interpretation must be allowed to the expositor of the New Testament, especially in its obscurer argumentative portions. What possible proof can we have that Paul, a Jew of Tarsus, was so thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the Greek language as to have employed its numerous particles with a due attention to their minutest differences of meaning,—that he used every preposition or conjunction precisely in the sense of Plato? Prejudicial, or even fatal, as this may seem to be to absolute certainty of interpretation, there appears no alternative but to allow the interpreter to trust more to the context and general usage of the writer, and to liberate him more from the strict classical signification of the letter, than would be desirable in other philological researches.

Once more: whatever opinions we may entertain as to the nature of inspiration, or the influence of the Holy Spirit on the writers of the New Testament, it is plain upon the surface that the Spirit did not mould their varying personalities into one likeness, but left upon their productions those marks of human individuality which we call, when speaking of ordinary literature, differences of style. The least observant critic could not mistake an Epistle of St. John for one of St. Paul. This, then, is a fact of which the orthodox, no less than the heterodox, commentator is compelled to take cognizance. And this also is the fact which justifies Mr. Jowett in his manner of arriving at the apostle's meaning. He rightly treats him as he would treat any other obscure Greek classic. Here is a man who is writing on a subject in which his whole heart is bound up, in a language over which he has but an imperfect mastery. The regularity of logical progression is in him continually interrupted and overborne by the quickness of perception and ardour of enthusiasm which constantly catch, nor can pass over unnoticed, some fresh topic of exhortation or discussion. No writer digresses so widely upon provocation apparently so small. And then he is not so much laying down a groundwork of principles, as addressing himself to the present necessities of persons. The particular schism which

divides the Corinthians, the special heresy which undermines the faith of the Galatians,—these are the topics in relation to which he enunciates truths, for which the whole Christian world now eagerly listens, as it were incidentally, or by the way. No writer, too, excels so pre-eminently in catching the points of justification of two opposite opinions, whenever it is possible that such should exist; and the result is sometimes, that he seems to pass with startling rapidity from one point of view to another, and at once almost to contradict himself, and to confound the less versatile and many-sided intellects of his readers. All these facts, and many more such, with which the diligent student of St. Paul's writings is sufficiently acquainted, form the basis of Mr. Jowett's principles of exposition. He is unwearied in the endeavour to track the course of the apostle's thought. He makes large use of that valuable means of exposition, the comparison of an obscure writer with himself. Above all, he is, as we have before remarked, singularly happy in the attempt to gain possession of the apostle's thought, uncoloured by any medium of ecclesiastical controversy; and if ever he fails, it is plain that the failure is not in consequence of theological bias.

Two of the more remarkable essays in Mr. Jowett's first volume are entitled respectively, "On the Conversion of St. Paul," and "Fragment on the Character of St. Paul." In the first of these he propounds an idea, which may also be traced in many other portions of his work, and which greatly conduces to the full apprehension of Paul's preaching, namely, that the suddenness and completeness of his own conversion, the marked way in which that event formed in his own soul the line of demarcation between the "old carnal man" and the "new creature," may explain much in his doctrine of conversion and regeneration which hardly seems to accord with our more sober experience. He to whom the vision on the way to Damascus had entirely changed the whole current of life, could hardly doubt the possibility of similar changes in others. From that moment of conversion radiated a light in which every event of subsequent existence was viewed. As Mr. Jowett beautifully remarks (I. 233):

"The vision which Paul saw on the way to Damascus followed him through his whole life. There was one image which hovered over him, one thought which urged him onward, one spirit which he breathed, one life which he lived: the image, the thought, the spirit, the life of Christ. In the ruder times of Christianity we have heard of saints whose eyes were ever fixed on the material image of the crucified Redeemer, who bore in their body the marks of the Lord Jesus. What is true of them in a grosser and more literal sense, is true of St. Paul figuratively and spiritually; he felt himself and all other Christians to be crucified with Christ. In all his affliction they are afflicted, even as they are the partakers of his glory, dying with him in sin and to sin, buried in baptism, filling up in their body the measure of his suffering, partaking of his hidden life in the grave, that with him also they may rise again.

If the Apostle rejoices, he is as one risen with Christ; if he suffers, he is crucified with Him; if at one and the same instant he suffers and triumphs and is a spectacle to the world, to angels, and to men, he is but as Christ was, who was lifted up from the earth that He might draw all men after Him. He is as one stricken to the earth, at the same time that he partakes of the vision of the Divine Glory."

Of the essay on the Character of St. Paul, which its author modestly entitles a "Fragment," we shall say nothing, but at once present the reader with three extracts, which, if not containing the whole pith of this very remarkable dissertation, will at least exemplify the winning simplicity and naturalness of the writer's style:

"More features appear of the character of St. Paul, yet not sufficient to give a perfect picture. We should lose the individuality which we have, by seeking to idealise and generalise from some more common type of Christian life. It has not been unusual to describe St. Paul as a man of resolute will, of commanding energy, of high-souled eloquence, of classic taste. Not of such an one would the Apostle himself 'have gloried.' It was not the wisdom of this world which he spoke, but the hidden wisdom of God in a mystery. All his life long he felt himself to be one 'whose strength was perfected in weakness;' he was aware of the impression of feebleness which his own appearance and discourse made upon his converts; who was sometimes in weakness and fear and trembling before them, 'having the sentence of death in himself,' and at other times 'in power and the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance;' and so far from having one unchanging purpose or insight, that though determined to know one thing only, 'Jesus Christ and Him crucified,' yet in his manner of teaching he wavers between opposite views or precepts in successive verses. He is ever feeling, if haply he may find them, after the hearts of men. He is carried away by sympathy at times even for his opponents. He is struggling to express what is in process of revelation to him. Such are some of the individual traits which he has left in his writings; they are traits far more interesting and more like himself than any general image of heroism or goodness. Whatever other impression he might have made upon us, could we have seen him face to face, there can be little doubt that he would have left the impression of what was remarkable and uncommon."—I. 291.

"Perhaps we shall not be far wrong in concluding, that those who have undergone great religious changes, have been of a fervid imaginative cast of mind; looking for more in this world than it was capable of yielding; easily touched by the remembrance of the past, or inspired by some ideal of the future. When with this has been combined a zeal for the good of their fellow-men, they have become the heralds and champions of the religious movements of the world. The change has begun within, but has overflowed without them. 'When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren,' is the order of nature and of grace. In secret they brood over their own state; weary and profitless, their soul fainteth within them. The religion they profess is a religion not of life to them, but of death: they lose their interest in the world, and are cut off from the communion of their fellow-men. While they are musing, the fire kindles, and at the last, 'they speak with their

tongue.' Then pours forth irrepressibly the pent-up stream 'unto all and upon all' their fellow-men; the intense flame of inward enthusiasm warms and lights up the world. First, they are the evidence to others: then, again, others are the evidence to them. All religious leaders cannot be reduced to a single type of character; yet in all, perhaps, two characteristics may be observed: the first, great self-reflection; the second, intense sympathy with other men. They are not the creatures of habit or of circumstance, leading a blind life, unconscious of what they are; their whole effort is to realise their inward nature, and to make it palpable and visible to their fellows. Unlike other men who are confined to the circle of themselves or of their family, their affections are never straitened; they embrace with their love all men who are like-minded with them; almost all men, too, who are unlike them, in the hope that they may become like.

"Such men have generally appeared at favourable conjunctures of circumstances, when the old was about to vanish away and the new to appear. The world has yearned towards them, and they towards the world. They have uttered what all men were feeling; they have interpreted the age to itself. But for the concurrence of circumstances, they might have been stranded on the solitary shore; they might have died without a follower or convert. But when the world has needed them, and God has intended them for the world, they are endued with power from on high; they use all other men as their instruments, uniting them to themselves.

"Often such men have been brought up in the faith which they afterwards oppose, and a part of their power has consisted in their acquaintance with the enemy. They see other men like themselves formerly, wandering out of the way in the idol's temple, amid a burdensome ceremonial, with prayer and sacrifices unable to free the soul. They lead them by the way themselves came to the home of Christ. Sometimes they represent the new as the truth of the old; at other times as contrasted with it, as life and death, as good and evil, as Christ and anti-Christ. They relax the force of habit, they melt the pride and fanaticism of the soul. They suggest to others their own doubts, they inspire them with their own hopes, they supply their own motives, they draw men to them with cords of sympathy and bonds of love: they themselves seem a sufficient stay to support the world. Such was the Luther at the Reformation; such, in a far higher sense, was the Apostle St. Paul."—I. 294.

"Great men are sometimes said to possess the power of command, but not the power of entering into the feelings of others. They have no fear of their fellows, but neither are they always capable of immediately impressing them, or of perceiving the impression which their words or actions make upon them. Often they live in a kind of solitude on which other men do not venture to intrude; putting forth their strength on particular occasions, careless or abstracted about the daily concerns of life. Such was not the greatness of the Apostle St. Paul: not only in the sense in which he says that 'he could do all things through Christ,' but in a more earthly and human one was it true, that this strength was his weakness, and his weakness his strength. His dependence on others was in part also the source of his influence over them. His natural character was the type of that communion with the

Spirit which he preached; the meanness of appearance which he attributes to himself, the image of that contrast which the Gospel presents to human greatness. Glorying and humiliation, life and death, a vision of angels strengthening him, the 'thorn in the flesh' rebuking him, the greatest tenderness not without sternness, sorrows above measure, consolations above measure, are some of the contradictions which were reconciled in the same man. The centre in which things so strange met and moved was the cross of Christ, 'whose marks in his body he bore;' what was 'behind of whose afflictions,' he rejoiced to fill up. Let us look once more a little closer at that 'visage marred' in his Master's service. A poor decrepit being, afflicted, perhaps, with palsy, certainly with some bodily defect—led out of prison between Roman soldiers, probably at times faltering in his speech, the creature, as he seemed to spectators, of nervous sensibility; yearning almost with a sort of fondness to save the souls of those whom he saw around him,—spoke a few eloquent words in the cause of Christian truth at which kings were awed, telling the tale of his own conversion with such simple pathos, that after ages have hardly heard the like.

"Such is the image, not which Christian art has delighted to consecrate, but which the Apostle has left in his own writings of himself; an image of true wisdom and nobleness and affection, but of a wisdom unlike the wisdom of this world; of a nobleness which must not be transformed into that of the heroes of the world; an affection which seemed to be as strong and as individual towards all mankind, as other men are capable of feeling towards a single person."—I. 303.

The essay entitled "St. Paul and the Twelve" was suggested by the narrative at the beginning of the Epistle to the Galatians, and is an acute historical criticism intended to shew that the relation in which Paul stood to the apostles at Jerusalem may be summed up in the words, "separation, not opposition; antagonism of the followers rather than of the leaders; personal antipathy of the Judaizers to St. Paul, rather than of St. Paul to the Twelve." We pass it by—not so much for want of appreciation of its value, as because it affords few materials for quotation—to turn to a very profound and complete disquisition on "St. Paul and Philo." This is, so far as we know, the first occasion on which the claims of Philo to the attention of Christian philosophers and philologists have been prominently brought before the English mind; though, through the diligence of Gfrörer, to whom Mr. Jowett acknowledges his obligations, German theologians have long been familiar with the subject. Yet it is of the highest importance that those who wish to understand thoroughly the writings of Paul and John, should know the history of the peculiar Greek idiom which they used; how the Greek and Hebrew mind had come together in Alexandria, and mingled to form that strange eclectic philosophy of which Philo is to us the representative; how in this way the Hebrew ideas which lay at the basis of Christianity acquired a form fitted to give them currency in the world of Greek letters.

"We see" (says Mr. Jowett, I. 348) "that in reading Philo we are on the very edge of Christianity. Philo might have seen and spoken with our Lord, and possibly did so in the visit to the temple which he mentions. Were it not for the distance between Alexandria and Judæa, we should say that he must have breathed the very same air, and been educated in the same belief and ways of thought, as the first disciples. He would have been just what Apollos of Alexandria was before his conversion, 'an eloquent man, learned in the Scriptures.' Nor does there seem any reason to doubt that the speculations of Alexandria and a knowledge of the Greek language had been transplanted to Judæa. The coincidences between Philo and St. Paul and St. John are a sufficient evidence that such must have been the case. For how did these coincidences arise? Either by Philo copying from St. Paul, which we have seen is already refuted by dates; or by St. Paul copying from Philo, a supposition which the dates admit of, but is otherwise wholly impossible; or by their both adopting a mode of thinking and a language which had already become familiar to the Jews, an hypothesis which moreover exactly answers to the kind of difference that we find between them. These similarities render Philo a mine of illustration for the language of the New Testament, to which no heathen author can in the least be compared."

Our limits, as well as the abstruse nature of the subject, prevent us from entering on the able analysis of Philo's system given by Mr. Jowett. It may be sufficient to say that he regards the resemblance between Philo and certain of the New-Testament writers as for the most part residing in the form, not the matter, of their thought. "Philo," he says (I. 413),

"— was a Jew; St. Paul a Christian. Philo an eclectic; St. Paul spake of himself as the Spirit gave him utterance. Philo was an Eastern mystic; St. Paul preached the resurrection of the body. Philo was an idealiser; St. Paul a spiritualiser of the Old Testament. Philo was a philosopher; St. Paul a preacher. The one taught a system for the few; the other a universal religion."

We pass over many interesting essays in Mr. Jowett's second volume, to pause for a moment on that entitled "Casuistry." The text on which it is a dissertation is the difficulty about meats offered to idols which was felt by the early church,—a difficulty which, though more fully discussed in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, is also, as our readers will remember, alluded to in chap. xiv. of the Epistle to the Romans. The essay begins with a clear statement and justification of the apostle's decision in the matter, and ends with a masterly analysis and exposure of the system of casuistry erected by the famous Jesuit moralists, who were once the target for Pascal's keen sarcasm and penetrating wit. It is, however, the middle portion to which we especially desire to draw our readers' attention, as affording some probable explanation of those peculiarities in Mr. Jowett's theological position to which we shall afterwards advert more fully. Under cover of the apostolic injunction, he directs a powerful battery

of argument against that over-scrupulousness which elevates every trifling difference of opinion and practice into a matter of conscience.

"We must not push consistency where it is practically impossible. A trifling scruple is raised to the level of a religious duty; and another and another, until religion is made up of scruples, and the light of life fades, and the ways of life narrow themselves."

And then he goes on to say:

"It is not hard to translate the Apostle's precept into the language of our time. Instances occur in politics, in theology, in our ordinary occupations, in which beyond a certain point consistency is impossible. Take for example the following: A person feels that he would be wrong in carrying on his business, or going to public amusements, on a Sunday. He says, if it be wrong for me to work, it is wrong to make the servants in my house work; or if it be wrong to go to public amusements, it is wrong to enjoy the recreation of walking on a Sunday. So it may be argued, that because slavery is wrong, therefore it is not right to purchase the produce of slavery, or that of which the produce of slavery is a part; and so on without end, until we are forced out of the world from a remote fear of contagion with evil. Or I am engaged in an employment which may be in some degree deleterious to the health or injurious to the morals of those who are employed in it; or I let a house to another who is so engaged. Numberless questions of the same kind relating to the profession of an advocate, a soldier, or a clergyman, have been pursued into endless consequences. In all these cases there is a point at which necessity comes in, and compels us to adopt the rule of the Apostle, which may be paraphrased, '*Do as other men do in a Christian country.*' Conscience may say, 'He who is guilty of the least, is guilty of all.' In the Apostle's language, it then becomes 'the strength of sin,' encouraging us to despair of all, because, in the mixed condition of life in which God has placed us, we cannot fulfil all."—II. 342.

Mr. Jowett goes on at considerable length and with great power to delineate the unhappiness of an over-scrupulous conscience, and to point out the danger therein involved of distorting the real proportions of various duty, of elevating the less to the level of the greater obligation.

"Scruples are dangerous....as they tend to drive men into a corner in which the performance of our duty becomes so difficult as almost to be impossible." "A man has a scruple about the choice of a profession; as a Christian he believes war to be unlawful; in familiar language, he has doubts respecting orders, difficulties about the law. Even the ordinary ways of conducting trade appear deficient to his nicer sense of honesty; or perhaps he has already entered on one of these lines of life, and finds it necessary to quit it. At last there comes the difficulty of 'how he is to live.'"

And then, finally, he sums up this part of his subject thus:

"In the Apostolic Church 'cases of conscience' arose out of religious traditions, and what may be called the ceremonial cast of the age; in modern times the most frequent source of them may be said to be the

desire of logical or practical consistency, such as is irreconcileable with the mixed state of human affairs, and the feebleness of the human intellect. There is no lever like the argument from consistency with which to bring men over to our own opinions. A particular system or view, Calvinism perhaps, or Catholicism, has taken possession of the mind. Shall we stop short of pushing its premises to their conclusions? Shall we stand in the midway, where we are liable to be overridden by the combatants on either side in the struggle? Shall we place ourselves between our reason and our affections; between our practical duties and our intellectual convictions? Logic would have us go forward and take our stand at the most advanced point—we are there already, it is urged, if we were true to ourselves—but feeling and habit and common sense bid us stay where we are, unable to give an account of ourselves, yet convinced that we are right. We may listen to the one voice: we may listen to the other. The true way of guiding either is to acknowledge both; to use them for a time against each other, until experience of life and of ourselves has taught us to harmonize them in a single principle.

"So, again, in daily life cases often occur *in which we must do as other men do, and act upon a general understanding, even though unable to reconcile a particular practice to the letter of truthfulness, or even to our own individual consciences. It is hard in such cases to lay down a definite rule. But in general we should be suspicious of any conscientious scruples which other good men do not share.* We shall do right to make a large allowance for the perplexities and entanglements of human things; we shall observe that men of strong mind brush away our scruples; we shall consider that not he who has most, but he who has fewest scruples, approaches most nearly the true Christian. For, as the Apostle says, 'Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin;' and 'Blessed is he who condemneth not himself in that which he alloweth.'"—II. 349, 350.

We agree with much that Mr. Jowett says of the practical danger of over-conscientiousness, though perhaps, from our point of view, we might be inclined to believe that the pressing peril to be guarded against in the world is, not that men should have too much conscience, but too little. But at the same time, we surely cannot err in saying that there is something in the above extracts against which any unsophisticated conscience would protest. Surely "duty is duty clear of consequence," and no "general understanding" can reconcile with right any practice contrary to "the letter of truthfulness or individual conscience." For what purpose has conscience been enthroned queen of the soul, if her authority is to be overborne by the universal consent of others? Of the motives which influence our own actions we may know something: how can we trace those which influence other men's practice? Out of St. Paul's mouth, and from the very passage which Mr. Jowett has quoted, it is, we think, easy to refute this dangerous error: "Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin." Whatever, that is, a man cannot justify to himself out of *his own* conscience, which, and not other men's practice, was given him to be the guide of *his own life*—whatever a man does not *himself* believe to be right, is not right, and cannot be made

right by any "general understanding." The will of the majority is a law in politics, but not in morals.

We cannot pause to discuss this matter at length, yet will take leave briefly to give our own view of it. The main cause of excessive moral scrupulousness is ignorance. A man who sticks at trifles, is one who is unable to see the entire aspect of a moral difficulty,—who fails to perceive the difference between the greater and the less obligation. If the practice of others can be used by him as a means of enlightening his own conscience, it is well. But if, still unconvinced, he follows the example of others, and puts a force upon his own conscience, as Mr. Jowett seems to recommend in the passages which we have italicised, what is this but "following after a multitude to do evil"? "Let every man be fully persuaded in *his own* mind."

We gladly pass on to recommend to the particular attention of our readers the very profound and suggestive series of essays with which Mr. Jowett closes his work. They are entitled respectively, "Natural Religion;" "The Law as the Strength of Sin;" "Righteousness by Faith;" "The Doctrine of the Atonement;" "Predestination and Free-will." The first of these treats not only of that portion of theological science commonly known as "natural theology," but contains much interesting dissertation on those forms of religion which we know to have historically existed apart from Jewish and Christian revelation, and concludes with a reference, conceived in a spirit of the most large-hearted charity, to that class of our fellow-citizens who, being apparently untouched by the specific influences of Christianity, are yet manifestly swayed by a species of natural religiousness, and are "a law unto themselves." To the second essay we may refer the student for a very full and, in some respects, original estimate of the way in which the Law practically and historically presented itself to St. Paul as the "strength of sin," as well as for arguments to shew how the same phrase may be understood and justified on purely speculative grounds. In the third, "Righteousness by Faith," Mr. Jowett begins to touch upon dangerous ground. The main thought contained in it is, perhaps, one which is more or less to be traced through the whole of his book, one of whose truth we have long been persuaded. It must have occurred to any student of theology, that the technical terms of his science are not at the same time scriptural, and that there is about them a metaphysical definiteness and precision which is altogether distinct from the manner in which words are used in the New Testament. It is a natural conclusion from the same thought, that such words as do at once occur in Scripture and modern theological disquisition, are in the latter case used with a peculiar accuracy of meaning; that it is not fair, for instance, to import the Lutheran *idea* of justification into the *word* as used by Paul. And hence, that as the

apostles and their converts used these words not so much to express *ideas* about the work of Christ, as the *facts* of the work of Christ, whereof they were conscious in their own souls,—our safest plan of interpretation is to try to disengage our minds from words with which metaphysical associations are inevitably connected, and to apprehend the spirit which breathes through the whole of the apostolic teaching. Yet, be it remarked, we must, on this theory, be contented with a greater indefiniteness of theological statement than that to which we have been accustomed, and console ourselves for it by the thought, that those who most felt the practical working of faith in Christ were perhaps least accustomed to define what that faith might be. The following passage partly developes this, partly another important truth.

"It has been said (and the remark admits of a peculiar application to theology), that few persons know sufficient of things to be able to say whether disputes are merely verbal or not. Yet, on the other hand, it must be admitted that whatever accidental advantage theology may derive from system and definition, mere accurate statements can never form the substance of our belief. No one doubts that Christianity could be in the fullest sense taught to a child or a savage without any mention of justification or satisfaction or predestination. Why should we not receive the Gospel as little children? Why adopt abstractions which are so subtle in their meaning as to be in the greatest danger in their translation from one language to another? which are always running into consequences inconsistent with our moral nature, and the knowledge of God derived from it? which are not the prevailing usage of Scripture, but technical terms which we have gathered from one or two passages, and made the key-notes of our scale?

"The words satisfaction and predestination nowhere occur in Scripture; the word regeneration only twice, and but once in a sense at all similar to that which it bears among ourselves; the word justification twice only, and nowhere as a purely abstract term.

"But although language and logic have so transfigured the meaning of Scripture, we cannot venture to say that all theological controversies are questions of words. If from their winding mazes we seek to retrace our steps, we still find differences which have a deep foundation in the opposite tendencies of the human mind and the corresponding divisions of the world itself. That men of one temper of mind adopt one expression rather than another, may be partly an accident; but the adoption of an expression by persons of marked character makes the difference of words a reality also. That can scarcely be thought a matter of words which cut in sunder the Church, which overthrew princes, which made the line of demarcation between Jewish and Gentile Christians in the Apostolic age, and is so in another sense between Protestant and Catholic at the present day. And in a deeper way of reflection than this, if we turn from the church to the individual, we seem to see around us opposite natures and characters, whose lives really exhibit a difference corresponding to that of which we are speaking. The one incline to morality, the other to religion; the one to the sacramental, the other to the spiritual; the one to multiplicity in outward ordinances, the

other to simplicity; the one consider chiefly the means, the other the end; the one desire to dwell upon doctrinal statements, the other need only the name of Christ; the one turn to ascetic practices, to lead a good life and to do good to others; the other to faith, humility, and dependence on God. We may sometimes find the opposite attributes combine with each other (there have ever been cross divisions on this article of belief in the Christian world): the great body of the Reformed Churches and a small minority of Roman Catholics before the Reformation being on the one side, and the whole Roman Catholic Church since the Reformation, and a section of the Protestant Episcopalians and some lesser communions, on the other: still, in general, the first of these characters answers to that doctrine which the Roman Church sums up in the formula of justification by works: the latter is that temper of mind which finds its natural dogmatic expression in the words, 'We are justified by faith.'"—I. 451, 452.

In his essay on "the Atonement," it is possible that many of our Unitarian readers may think that Mr. Jowett pushes to an extreme his protest against a metaphysical definition of Christian faith. He says in very plain terms, as the following admirable passage shews, what he thinks the Atonement is not; he is hardly so clear in its statement of what it is.

"Thus far the parts of the logical structure are 'fitly joined together,' but the main question is yet untouched: In what did this satisfaction consist? Was it that God was angry and needed to be propitiated like some heathen deity of old? Such a thought refutes itself by the very indignation which it calls up in the human bosom. Or that as 'He looked upon the face of his Christ,' pity gradually took the place of wrath, and, like some conqueror, He was willing to include in the reversal of the sentence not only the hero, but all those who were named after His name? Human feelings again revolt at the idea of attributing to the God in whom we live and move and have our being, the momentary clemency of a tyrant. Or was it that there was a debt due to Him which must be paid ere its consequences could be done away? But even a man's debt may be freely forgiven, nor could the after-payment change our sense of the offender's wrong: we are arguing about what is moral and spiritual from what is legal, or, more strictly, from a shadow and figment of law. Or that there were some impossibilities, in the nature of things, which prevented God from doing other than he did? Thus we introduce a moral principle superior to God, just as in the Grecian mythology fate and necessity are superior to Jupiter. But we have not so learned the Divine nature, believing that God, if He transcend our ideas of morality, can yet never be in any degree contrary to them.

"Or again, if we take a different line of explanation, it may be urged that the atonement is not a satisfaction of Divine justice, but only a 'quasi satisfaction,' or rather an exhibition of Divine justice in the eyes of mankind and of the angels. Something of this kind may be supported (according to one interpretation of the passage) by the words of the third chapter of Romans, 'To shew forth, I say at this time, His righteousness on account of the non-observance of sins that are past:' where the reason given for the manifestation of Christ seems to be the

justification of the ways of God to men. According to this view, it is regarded as shocking that God himself should have needed any atonement or satisfaction. But yet it would seem as if God's horror of sin were not sufficiently marked—that man, to use a homely phrase, was let off too easily—unless there were some great and open manifestation that God was really on the side of truth and of right. To demonstrate this was the object of the death of Christ. It was a reality in one sense, that is so far as the sufferings were real; an appearance in another, as its true import related to mankind and the world and not to God.

"If this scheme avoids the difficulty of offering an unworthy satisfaction to God, and so doing violence to His attributes, we can scarcely free it from an equal difficulty of interposing a painful fiction between God and man. Was the spectacle real which was presented before God and the angels on Mount Calvary? If we say no, then we can neither trust our eyes or ears, nor the promises of God, or the words of Scripture. If the greatest fact of the whole is an illusion, why not all else? That the chief figure in the scene is the Son of God, only makes the illusion the more impossible. Or if we say that it was all real, and yet that its great object was an exhibition to men and angels, to what a wonderful straitness do we reduce Divine power, which can only shew forth its justice by allowing men to commit in itself the greatest of human crimes, that redeems the sin of Adam by the murder of Christ! This second theory has no advantage over the preceding, except that which the more shadowy statement must ever have, in rendering difficulties themselves more shadowy. It avoids the physical illusion of the old heretics and introduces a moral illusion of a worse kind.

"For if we substitute for 'satisfaction,' 'demonstration,' or exhibition of Divine justice, we are not better off than in the previous attempt to explain 'satisfaction.' How could the sufferings of a good or divine man exhibit the righteousness of God? Rather, they would seem to indicate His indifference to those sufferings in permitting them, in not giving His Son 'ten legions of angels' to overcome his enemies. Is it to the Roman soldiers, or to the Jews, or to the disciples, that this exhibition is supposed to have a meaning, or to the world afterwards, who in the sufferings of Christ are expected to see for all time the indignation of God against sin? When the doctrine is stated, it betrays itself. For how could there be an exhibition of Divine justice which was known to be a fiction; which, if it were true and real, would be horrible and revolting; which not only exhibits the sins of the guilty laid upon the innocent, but alleviates human feelings by assuring us that they are laid upon that innocent being, not as the payment of a penalty or satisfaction of the Divine nature, but as the demonstration of Divine justice. The doctrine thus stated is the surface or shadow of the preceding, with the substance or foundation cut away. It removes one difficulty, and in removing it raises up a number of others."—II. 472—474.

He concludes his essay with the following remarkable passage:

"We can live and die, in the language of St. Paul and St. John, without fear for ourselves or dishonour to the name of Christ. We need not change a word that they use, or add on a single consequence to their statement of the truth. There is nothing there repugnant to our moral sense. There are others to whom tradition and devotional use may have

made another kind of language familiar, who employ it by a sort of happy inconsistency without perceiving the contradiction which it involves to the attributes of God. Neither let them condemn us, neither let us condemn them. There is enough in what has been said, and in the very nature of the subject itself, to make us tolerant of each other. It is a natural though hardly excusable weakness to clothe with peculiar awe and sacredness that which is really of human invention; to be zealous in defence of those points which we instinctively know to be least capable of standing the test of theological criticism."—II. 482.

But it is time that we turned from the analysis of Mr. Jowett's book to a few concluding remarks on the peculiarities of his theological position. Were we not so completely habituated to the existence in the Establishment of the most divergent tendencies of opinion,—were we not familiar with the spectacle of a Church which, professing to define Christian truth with the utmost rigour, retains within its fold Pusey and M'Neile and Maurice,—we should certainly marvel to see a book like that of which we have given a brief account issuing from the high places of Oxford. We know that there are many who consider such facts as these as among the most hopeful signs of the times. We could almost wish that we were of the number. Beyond doubt a liberal Christianity is a good thing, and full of hopeful augury, in whatever section of Christ's fold it shews itself; and a manly, thoughtful, religious book like this of Mr. Jowett's, a precious boon to the Church, whatever be the ecclesiastical position of its author. But, at the same time, we have inherited from the Presbyterianism of 1660 a profound conviction that theological honesty is a quality which lies at the very basis of the Christian student's character. Whatsoever a man deliberately believes to be true, that let him speak, though speech involve shipwreck of all worldly interests. Above all, let him not tacitly or implicitly, much less formally, pronounce his adhesion to opinions which deliberately he does not believe to be true. The man who is false to his intellectual convictions cannot—so is our firm belief —long continue true to his moral intuitions. The tree is rotten at the bole; the fair, white sepulchre inwardly is full of death.

We may seem to speak somewhat strongly on this point. We do so because it is a species of immorality which is becoming characteristic of our age. Churches are drifting slowly, but surely, away from their old mooring-places. Once a man's denominational name was a label which expressed his opinions; now, if we would know what he believes, there is no shorter process than a personal cross-examination. The Roman Catholic Church, indeed, remains standing upon the ancient ways. But in English Protestant Churches, the more any person thinks and reads for himself, the less likely is he to be in precise accordance with old theological distinctions. Does the High Church, or the Low Church, or the Broad Church, really represent that invisible

entity, that indefinable unity, which calls itself *the* Church of England? How numerous are the shades and phases of Genevan Calvinism which are to be met with among the so-called orthodox Dissenters? Who does not know that, in arguing against the Trinity, it is no longer admitted by private disputants that the Creed of Athanasius, or indeed any known creed, is a precise statement of their faith?—that, in combating the Atonement, it is now necessary to come to some preliminary agreement as to what the doctrine really is? There are theories of the Trinity, widely received, which on examination prove to be no more than metaphorical statements of the methods of Divine manifestation; there are schemes of Atonement into which the idea of vicarious sacrifice does not enter. Is not all this, then, a pleasing sight for those who fought the battle of liberal Christianity when the day was hot and the struggle fierce? Beyond a doubt. But then it is neither a right nor a fair thing for churches or individuals to profess liberality and to reap the good things of orthodoxy; to turn a Janus face alike to the thinking few who pay, and the unthinking many who exact the penalty of free thought. It is the boast of certain members of the Church of England that within the limits of her articles and creeds and ritual, "ample room and verge enough" was left for many divergences of Christian faith; and that the present state of things is a natural and logical consequence of arrangements consciously made at the period of the Reformation. But then let the doctrinal basis be at least as wide as the structure which it is to sustain. It is right and well that persons of differing opinions should unite in Christian communion; but neither right nor well that they should pretend to ignore or deny in their theory of a Church the differences which they practically recognize. Men whose boast is of unrestricted inquiry, ought not to sign as a bond of union a restrictive creed. If the practice of the Church is to be comprehensive, let her theory be comprehensive too. But the practical comprehension of the most diverse opinions within a fold whose limits are marked out by creeds and articles the most precise—to what can this lead, except the arrogant assumption of true Churchmanship by Anglo-catholic and Evangelical alike,—the angriest display of sectarian bitterness and unbrotherly contention even within the Church,—the exclusion from its privileges of the consciences too tender, the intellects too keen, to accept its nominal formularies,—and the utmost latitude of non-natural interpretation (a monstrous birth peculiar to theology of all the sciences!) on the part of those who find themselves in a prison-house, which is at the same time their souls' long-accustomed home?

Let it be observed, however, that we bring no charge of *moral* dishonesty against men who, like Mr. Jowett, remain in connection with the Church, although their writings shew them to

entertain opinions manifestly inconsistent with her Articles. We desire to distinguish between moral and intellectual dishonesty, between falsehood to duty and falsehood to conviction. If a man sign the Articles, knowing all the while that he does not believe them, for the sake of Church preferment, or in fear of public opprobrium or private reproach, or because he thinks the Church must be right, or because he will not forsake an accustomed sphere of profit or usefulness,—we have no other alternative than to pronounce him dishonest in the usual acceptation of the term. No sophism can justify the lie of stating that to be true which in our heart we believe to be false. This may be the position of some weaker minds, some corrupt consciences; we would hope that they are but few. It is far more usually the case that the manifest heretic has some intellectual process by which he proves to himself that his impugned opinions are really coincident with the Articles which he subscribes. We cannot even so much as guess what these processes are. Our Presbyterian education has but ill fitted us for treading in the dark by-paths of casuistry. But we are compelled to believe in their existence by what we know of the high moral character of many of those divines whose theological position is the hardest for us to understand. Arnold, Hare, Maurice, Robertson, Stanley, Jowett—these are not men against whom we can cast the stone of accusation, and charge with living a life which, if dishonest, must be unutterably wretched, as each recurring week brings round the public profession of faith. We can only say that we understand them—perhaps as little as they understand us. We can only express our belief that had they been born in a community where free thought in matters of religion was not crushed by the threat of all earthly and eternal penalties, their conclusions would have been more clear, their arguments more consistent, their life freer from harassing doubts and unreal fears.

Mr. Jowett's book, as may be supposed from the citations made in the former part of this article, has created no small tumult among the defenders of Oxford orthodoxy. The fact, however, to which we particularly desire to draw attention is the following. Soon after the publication of the work, a letter was addressed to the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford, signed by J. D. Macbride, D.C.L., Principal of Magdalen Hall, and C. P. Golightly, M.A., Oriel College, complaining of certain statements made by Mr. Jowett, and requesting the Vice-Chancellor "to ascertain whether he is prepared to renew his subscription to the Articles of Religion, and to the three Articles of the 36th Canon of the Book of Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical of the Synod of London of A.D. 1603." The letter, which is temperate enough, simply contrasts three extracts from Mr. Jowett's book, of which the reader may gain an adequate idea from our quotation from the essay on the Atonement, with the Second

Article, and with that passage in the Book of Common Prayer which maintains that our Saviour "by His one oblation of Himself once offered, made a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." Upon this showing the Vice-Chancellor complied with the request, and Mr. Jowett immediately performed the required subscription.

What next? Mr. Jowett does everything that the Church or the law requires him to do in order to prove himself a Churchman, and yet it is plain upon the surface of his writings that, in the sense in which the term is usually understood, he is no Churchman at all. Was there ever a more complete reductio ad absurdum of the supposed efficacy of a test in excluding error from a religious community? It is of course an occurrence which has taken place often enough before, yet rarely in so marked a form as this. The demon of heresy mocks at the exorcisers, and will not be cast out. The University, if we may judge from the spirit of some statutes recently prepared for particular colleges, seems only to meditate more stringent tests, and a more rigid standard of orthodoxy. The true moral of the matter is (and let our creed-loving Unitarian friends take it to heart, if there indeed be any such), that the only possible operation of a test is to let in those whom it was meant to exclude, and to exclude those whom it was designed to keep in.

And yet—we say it in all sober sadness—it is a melancholy dilemma for the Church, an unhappy position for Mr. Jowett. We cannot believe that the author of such a book as this, so profoundly Christian in its reverence for unadulterated apostolic truth, can be other than an honest man. He commands our love for his moral nature as imperatively as our admiration for his talents. Would that our voice of friendly remonstrance might reach and touch him! We claim him not as a believer in our own views of Christianity; to his own Master he standeth or falleth. But we are sure that he is wrongly placed where he is. The countenance of good men to quiet the scruples of conscience, is but a poor substitute for the peace which is the result of convictions followed to their natural and logical consequences. And if, hampered by creeds and articles, into which he is compelled to breathe a life which is not in them, he has done so much for Christian truth, what might we not expect from the mind and soul which should press on into yet untrodden fields of the spiritual universe, unburdened by any responsibility save that of a free will to the Author of its freedom!

C.

## MR. STEINTHAL ON THE TIME OF MR. HOWORTH'S PROFESSION OF ORTHODOXY.

Sir,

In the very interesting historical sketch of the Rochdale congregation, there is one sentence which might leave a wrong impression upon the minds of your readers, although, no doubt, Mr. Smith intended to convey no meaning but the exact truth. I allude to the passage referring to the Rev. F. Howorth, on p. 359: "His connection with that society (the Silver-Street chapel, Bury) and with the Presbyterian denomination has been lately severed by his profession of Trinitarian sentiments."

As in an historical statement perfect accuracy is essential, I beg to state that when Mr. Howorth resigned the pastorate of Silver-Street chapel, he was a Unitarian; the change in his opinions took place subsequently to his separation from his old flock. He left his old congregation in July, 1853, but did not publicly declare his change of opinion until January, 1855. There was therefore a period of time between the severance of the connection with the Silver-Street congregation and the Presbyterian denomination. In a periodical like the Reformer, which is proverbial for its accuracy, I think I may safely claim the insertion of the above correction.

S. Alfred Steinthal.

*Bridgwater, June 9th,* 1856.

---

## THE CAUSE OF DARKNESS.

BY R. E. B. MACLELLAN.

When Night in gathered gloom descends,
And all things bright and fair have fled,
And tints of skies and hues of flowers
Are numbered with the lost and dead,—
'Tis not the *Sun* has grown unkind,
Or even withholds a single ray,
'Tis only that this isle of ours
Has wandered from his light away.

So when at times our troubled souls
Thick clouds of sin or grief invade,
And only power enough remains
To weep and feel about for aid,—
'Tis not that our good God has hid
His love, His pity, or His grace;
'Tis but that our unfaithful hearts
Have turned them from the Father's face.

Oh! not in Him the mournful change;
In our unhappy selves alone
The darkness lies; and when once more
We turn us to His radiant throne,
He'll shine upon our anxious gaze
With not one sacred smile the less,
Both willing and delighted still
To soothe, to welcome, and to bless.

# INTELLIGENCE.

PRESBYTERIAN CHAPEL, ST. SAVIOUR-GATE, YORK.

A service of an interesting nature took place at this chapel on the morning of Sunday, May 25. The Rev. Newcome Cappe, the predecessor of Mr. Wellbeloved, was ordained on the 26th of May, 1756.* He had been invited, in September, 1755, to become minister in the room of the Rev. Mr. Root, who had been co-pastor with the Rev. John Hotham, and on Mr. Hotham's death, in the beginning of 1756, was chosen sole pastor. It was thought by the congregation that an occurrence so remarkable as that the pastorship of two ministers should fill up a century, was deserving of a special religious commemoration. Rev. H. V. Palmer, the assistant minister, introduced the service with appropriate lessons and prayers, and Rev. J. Kenrick preached from Zechariah i. 5, "Your fathers, where are they; and the prophets, do they live for ever?" After illustrating the first part of this passage, the preacher continued: "But my text calls me to other considerations. The prophets are as frail and mortal as those for whose instruction God raises them up. The servant can but labour his appointed hours; the evening comes when the hands grow weary, and is followed by the night in which no man can work. The stores of accumulated knowledge can be used no longer; the tongue loses its power of eloquent utterance; the day of active usefulness is closed. Yet the prophet's interest in the scene of his labours does not cease when he is about to be translated to a higher sphere. His desire and prayer is that those whom he has laboured to enlighten, to form to virtue, and to prepare for heaven, should be placed under a guidance as affectionate and faithful as his own. He looks earnestly around him to find some one on whom he may cast his mantle, and on whom his spirit may descend if possible in double measure. Such thoughts, we know from his biographer, occupied Mr. Cappe's mind when he could no longer fulfil his ministerial duties, nor hope to resume them. And we know, too, how his prayers were answered and his anxieties relieved. It is always a delicate task to speak of the virtues of the living; it would be especially so for me in the present instance; I will quote a passage from his Memoir by his widow. 'Among his many remaining comforts,' she observes, 'Mr. Cappe always reckoned in the foremost rank the having met with a colleague in whom he early discovered an ardent love of truth, especially of religious truth; talents equal to its development, and dispositions the most amiable. He felt for him a truly paternal affection; often did he please himself with anticipating what he believed would be his future eminence, and he always looked forward to him as his successor in his ministerial office in this city with singular complacency and satisfaction.' How amply Time has set his seal to these anticipations, you, my friends, are the best witnesses. We thankfully acknowledge, for ourselves, the blessing of having enjoyed for so many years the services of a beloved and venerated pastor; and, for him, the kindness of Providence which has lengthened his life beyond the ordinary term of mortality, and, amidst many sharp visitations of affliction, in body and in spirit, with so few of the painful infirmities of age. But let us not forget that to have enjoyed these services, to have witnessed these virtues, is a talent of which we must render an account; and the longer it has remained in our possession, the greater is the improvement

* As this service has nearly fallen into desuetude amongst us, a copy of the certificate may have something of an antiquarian interest. "York, May 26, 1756. These are to certify whom it may concern that the Reverend Mr. Newcome Cappe, after a regular course of studies to qualify himself for it with the most promising abilities, and character not only unexceptionable but most commendable, was by us, whose names are hereunto subscribed, this day and in this place solemnly and with the greatest satisfaction ordained to the work of the ministry, in which we do most earnestly and affectionately wish him all possible success, and recommend him to God's blessing, as witness our hands.

WM. WHITAKER,
JOHN ANGIER,
THOMAS WHITAKER,
THOMAS WALKER,
JNO. HARRIS,
EDWARD SANDERCOCK,
JER. GILL,
THOS. ELLIS,
BEN. CLEGG."

we may be expected to make of it. Let us not then consider a ministry prolonged to its sixty-fifth year merely as an extraordinary phenomenon, a remarkable exception to the ordinary laws of life; but ask ourselves what that religious society ought to be, to which such instructions and such an example have been vouchsafed so long."

It was mentioned as a remarkable circumstance that no one of the actual congregation of St. Saviourgate could claim descent from or even remote affinity with a single individual of those who, in 1756, invited Mr. Cappe to take upon himself the pastorship—that of his own once numerous family, one person only was now the representative—and that even of those who worshiped here when his successor entered upon his office, but one family is now represented in the congregation by its descendants.

The presence of a considerable number of strangers on this occasion was indicative of the high respect in which Mr. Wellbeloved is held, beyond the limits of his own denomination, for his learning, his private virtues, and the long and disinterested services rendered by him to every institution designed for the benefit of his fellow-citizens.

---

### WEST-RIDING UNITARIAN TRACT AND MISSION SOCIETY.

The forty-first annual meeting of this Society took place in Leeds on Wednesday, June 11th. In the morning, a sermon was preached at Mill-Hill chapel by the Rev. J. Panton Ham, of Cross-Street chapel, Manchester. At two o'clock in the afternoon, a large party of ladies and gentlemen sat down to a collation in the Stock-Exchange Hall, where, at half-past three o'clock, a public meeting was held, under the presidency of Darnton Lupton, Esq. The gentlemen present included the Revds. Thos. Hincks (Leeds), Edward Higginson (Wakefield), J. H. Ryland (Bradford), H. V. Palmer (York), J. Owen (Lydgate), J. Kenrick (York), J. K. Montgomery (Huddersfield), J. P. Ham (Manchester), W. Elliott (Doncaster), A. M'Combe (Idle), E. Hall (Holbeck), J. Knapton (Pudsey), and B. Herford (Sheffield); and J. Lupton, Esq., George Buckton, Esq., Henry Briggs, Esq. (Outwood), H. C. Briggs, Esq. (Outwood), W. Brown, Esq., J. Cliff, Esq., E. Swaine, Esq., W. Swaine, Esq. (Leeds), T. A. Ward, Esq. (Sheffield), &c.

The Chairman (after the toast of "The Queen" had been given) proposed the toast of "Civil and Religious Liberty." He reminded the company present that, in days gone by, fines, imprisonment and even death, followed the avowal of those principles which were now openly held by those around him. Let them remember this fact, and then look at Manchester, Liverpool, Sheffield, Birmingham, Leeds, and, indeed, all large towns, and they would find that they were Unitarians who held the most distinguished positions in them. There was a band of Unitarians in the House of Commons who were exercising a sure and certain influence upon that House—an influence which was diffusing itself, and that would make itself felt, throughout the country. Let them look to the borough of Leicester, where there was a population of 60,000 persons. That borough wanted a Member, and two Unitarians stood forward to represent that great borough—they stood forward in the presence of the whole empire, and no man dared to oppose them.

The Rev. E. Higginson, Secretary, read the forty-first annual report of the Society. It began by reciting a resolution passed at the previous annual meeting at Huddersfield, to the effect that it was indispensable to the continued success of the Mission to increase its reliable funds, and earnestly requesting that the local treasurers should, in connection with the ministers of their respective localities, arrange for congregational collections, as an experiment upon the feasibility of making it an annual source of income. Four congregations had responded to this resolution, and the amount collected more than covered the debt due to the Treasurer at the beginning of the year. These collections were—at Bradford, £7. 7*s.* 7*d.*; Huddersfield, £3. 8*s.* 6*d.*; Halifax, £4. 16*s.* 1*d.*; and Leeds, £15; total, £30. 12*s.* 2*d.* At the last annual meeting, the office of Missionary was vacant by the removal of Mr. Moon to Sheffield; and the Committee that day met and applied to the British and Foreign Unitarian Association for a guarantee of £25 per annum. To this application the Association acceded; but the Committee had that (yesterday) morning resolved to decline the guarantee for the present year, and to trust to the zeal of the Riding itself to supply the deficiency for the coming year. The Treasurer's account shewed a balance of a few shillings only against

the Society, in place of £21 due to him at the last anniversary. The Committee expressed their desire to see the list of subscribers increased, so as to make the Mission independent of more distant aid. The vacancy in the Mission caused by the removal of Mr. Moon was filled up by the appointment of Mr. James Knapton. In the Tract department, the Committee reported the usual distribution of books and pamphlets to members in return for their subscription, and the sale of a moderate amount besides. The total number distributed was 940, and the money value of them £40. 5*s.* 4½*d.* In the election of officers for the next year, the Committee proposed to join Mr. Hincks's name to that of Mr. George Buckton as local treasurer for Leeds; to elect Mr. Elliott for Doncaster; Mr. Robert Edleston for Halifax; and to elect Mr. Talbot, of Leeds, as auditor, in place of Mr. F. Jackson. A deputation was present from Sheffield, representing the wish of many members of the Upper chapel in that town to join the Society, and a resolution would be submitted to the meeting to welcome their co-operation, as a valuable accession of strength to the West-Riding Unitarian Tract and Mission Society. The report also stated that the annual subscriptions at present amounted to about £90; whilst the necessary expenses of the Mission, under a single missionary, were between £110 and £120.

Mr. Knapton read the report of his Mission labours at Pudsey, Windhill and Stanningley, during the ten months of his appointment, which he regarded as being, upon the whole, satisfactory, though there was not much to report of progress made.

Mr. H. C. Briggs, Treasurer, read the cash account, from which it appeared that the receipts during the year had been 168*l.* 15*s.* 2*d.*, and the expenditure 169*l.* 11*s.* 10*d.*, leaving a balance of 16*s.* 8*d.* against the Society.

Mr. H. Briggs proposed that the reports which had been read should be adopted, printed and circulated; and said that he was most anxious to see the labours of the Unitarian Mission very much extended in the villages of the West-Riding.

Mr. Joseph Lupton, in seconding the adoption of the reports, congratulated the Unitarians of the West-Riding upon the refusal of the Committee to receive the grant from London in aid of the Mission of this district. It was very undesirable that the Unitarians of the great and wealthy West-Riding should proclaim to the world that they were unable to do this work without applying for pecuniary aid to the Association in London. He trusted that the determination of the Committee would be followed by a resolution on the part of the whole body of Unitarians to carry on the work of their Society with renewed and increased vigour. Referring to the report of Mr. Knapton, Mr Lupton expressed a wish that the Mission, especially at Windhill, should be prosecuted with vigour; for there was in the neighbourhood of this Mission an important town rapidly growing up—the town of Saltaire. Saltaire was likely to become a town of 10,000 inhabitants; and it was most desirable that the opportunity should be seized of making Unitarianism known in that important and rapidly-rising manufacturing district.

The Chairman moved a vote of thanks to the officers of the Society, and their re-election, subject to the alterations mentioned in the report.

The Rev. E. Higginson having read the list of new books to be included in their catalogue, Mr. Swaine briefly moved the thanks of the meeting to the Rev. P. Ham for his sermon that morning.—The vote was seconded by the Rev. J. Kenrick, who expressed his gratification in seeing so able a minister united to them from another denomination.

The Rev. J. P. Ham acknowledged the compliment in a speech of some length, in the course of which he pointed out that there was not that denominationalism among the Unitarians that existed in some other Christian bodies, and caused them to be less effective than they would otherwise be. He advocated the bringing into active co-operation the elements of Unitarianism, so as to create and concentrate their influence upon the character and feelings and sympathies of the general public. At the same time, he asserted that there was more real unity among the Unitarians than among the Independents or the Episcopalians of this country. Other Christians—the Independents and others—shewed the greatest anxiety to extend their foreign missions; but it was the peculiar characteristic of Unitarianism to make home the sphere of their especial labours. The London Missionary Society expended more than £100,000 a-year on foreign missions; but what did the

Unitarians expend upon their home missions? They were not doing what they ought to do in this respect; and he conjured them to act more worthily of their position and influence and numbers than they had hitherto done in this great and good work.

Mr. T. Todd (Dewsbury) proposed the following sentiment: "The West-Riding Tract and Village Mission Society: may its success increase."—The resolution or sentiment was seconded in an earnest address by the Rev. J. H. Ryland, and acknowledged by the Rev. Ed. Higginson in a speech of much warmth and eloquence.

The Rev. Thomas Hincks proposed a resolution to the effect that the Society gave a hearty welcome to the Sheffield congregation and ministers on the occasion of joining the West-Riding Association.—The resolution was seconded by the Rev. J. K. Montgomery, spoken to by Mr. Ryland, and acknowledged by the Rev. Brooke Herford in an earnest address, in which he combated some objections to the last resolution which had been raised by the Rev. J. H. Ryland.—After some other proceedings, the meeting terminated.

---

BELFAST UNITARIAN SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of this Society was held for the transaction of business in the First Presbyterian church, Rosemary Street, on Monday, June 2nd. Dr. Burden occupied the chair. The meeting was opened with prayer, after which the Rev. C. J. M'Alester, the Secretary, read the report, from which we take the following:

Last summer an application was made to your Committee by a small congregation of Unitarian Christians at Girvan, in Scotland, to send over a minister occasionally, and they proposed an annual contribution towards the expenses which the Society would thus incur. The Committee thought it right to meet the wishes of the Girvan brethren, at least for one year; and accordingly the Secretary went over in the month of July, and officiated one Lord's-day in the neat and commodious church which they had erected. The attendance at the several services was not numerous; but the decision and earnestness of the little band in that isolated position deserve our sympathy and help. The Rev. F. M'Cammon, the Rev. W. Hall and the Rev. D. Gordon, have since visited them, and the reports which they have given induce your Committee to recommend that aid should be continued to the Girvan congregation, either by affording quarterly supplies as hitherto, or in such other way as may seem desirable.

It is hoped that the object of this Society will gradually enlist more of the sympathy and support of those who hold the doctrines which it represents. Were its operations to be merely limited to the keeping of a depository for the sale of works enforcing the duties of religion, and illustrating and defending rational and consolatory views of gospel truth, and also for the circulation of tracts, it would accomplish an important good; but the friends of liberal Christianity in Ulster should not be satisfied with this—they should labour to extend a knowledge of the truth, as they hold it, to others. Their small means may not enable them to do much for the preaching of the gospel in other lands; but kindred Societies in England and America are engaged in sustaining the gospel in Australia and in India, and it would be a privilege, as surely it is a duty, to help our brethren in their laudable and Christian efforts. The tidings that reach us from India and Australia are calculated to awaken confident expectations that in those distant lands the knowledge of the one true God, the Father, may be extended; while the American brethren, through the missionary labours of Mr. Tanner, are sowing the seeds of gospel truth among the Indians of the Far West, and revealing to them the "Great Spirit," as he is declared through his only-begotten Son.

The report was adopted, after which various resolutions were passed, some of a routine character. Others were to this effect:

That there is but one God, the Father, and that there is one Lord, Jesus Christ, are great fundamental principles of the gospel, the advocacy of which, amid prevailing and popular errors, demands our earnest and devoted exertions.

That it is incumbent on those who hold rational and consolatory views of Christian truth, to give their best endeavours for their extension, not only at home, but in foreign lands; and that while our resources do not admit of our sending missionaries abroad, we should aid, by our pecuniary contributions, the brethren in England and America who are labouring to spread Unitarian Christianity in India and other distant lands.

That the Committee for the ensuing year be instructed to give their early attention to the improvement of the depository, and to the adoption of some systematic measures for the circulation of tracts.

PROVINCIAL MEETING.

This long-established assembly of the Presbyterian ministers of the counties of Lancaster and Chester, now in the third century of its existence, met on Thursday, June 19, at Manchester. At the assembly of 1855, held in Liverpool, Stand had been the place appointed for this year's meeting; but when it was arranged that Mr. Channing should be the preacher, it was resolved to hold the meeting in Manchester, and to convene the assembly in the spacious and venerable chapel of Cross Street. The evening previous to the assembly was, by invitation from Mr. R. N. Philips, the High Sheriff of the county, passed by the ministers and a large party of friends at the Park. The house and the beautiful grounds were thrown open to the visiters, and in the enjoyment of the society and hospitality of their host, a very delightful evening was passed. A band of music, supplied by the youths of the noble school established by Mr. Philips, attended in the grounds, and performed a variety of pieces both instrumental and vocal. Later on in the evening the garden soirée was interfered with by rain. This unfortunately continued during the whole of the following day, and was so heavy as to prove a serious drawback to the numbers and pleasure of the meeting. A pretty numerous congregation assembled in the chapel at half-past eleven o'clock. The devotional service was conducted by Mr. Channing with his accustomed fervour. He took for his text Ephes. iii. 20, 21, "Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end." The preacher then uttered this exordium: "Fathers, brethren, Christian friends, this occasion is to the preacher one of the deepest interest, because he feels that it is once for all in his natural life, that once for all upon this little globe, he meets many of you here to utter, as in the presence of God, what God has given him faith to believe. I know that you will hereafter judge, my fathers, of what I say from the position of spiritual knowledge in the eternal world; I know, my brethren, that you and I will, after our struggles upon this earth, interchange our views once more in regard to the realities upon which we are to-day to meditate. Bear with me while, in perfect sincerity of soul, as before the heart-searching God, I endeavour as briefly as I can to unfold what is the result of many years' seeking after truth. I make this earnest appeal because I foresee that I shall say some things which your judgments will not approve. Some things I shall say may appear to some of you vague, visionary and transcendental. Let me remind you of a fact. In the far-distant islands of the Pacific Sea, the natives who are skilled trace in the atmosphere, while yet far off, the coming fleets. Let me dare to say that, living in a region of hope, I do but anticipate, in what shall seem to some but cloudy, transcendental speculation, what shall prove God's precious messengers, sent with real good to common life. It is in regard to the signs of the times in the Christian church, and the duties of the church, that I would ask you to meditate this morning." Mr. Channing then proceeded to observe that everywhere and for ever the Divine Being carried on his great scheme for man by employing the differences of men to balance and harmonize one another. Conservatism, innovation and compromise, were among these means, and each had its accompanying dangers. The danger of conservatism was, that it strove to retain the mere form which society had outgrown. The danger of innovation was in rejecting the spirit of the past and the wisdom of traditional institutions. The danger of compromise was the committing society to falsehood, not stating purely and freely the truths of the past or of the future, and losing the true wisdom of observing the times by falling into time-serving. No one could be truly wise who was not at once conservative, innovating and conciliatory; and no one could combine all these elements who did not, out of the very life which God gave him, and by the wisdom which God imparted to him, recognize most distinctly what is the position of men at the very age in which his lot was cast. In regard to the present age, there was no danger of exaggeration in saying that Providence distinctly pointed it out as one of transition in human affairs. Let them now look at the elements of the age, and recognize some of the dangers which threatened Christendom, as well as the great hopes which were ready to aid them, as God's guardians, if they were but faithful in the service. In the first place, on the extreme side of conservatism stood the hierarchical

party in the Church, allied to the despotic and centralizing party in the State, taking the control of all authority, and dictating from that authority to all modes of education, all modes of popular enlightenment, and exhibiting itself in the social form of distinct castes. This was not peculiar to that or any other nation—it was the character of that era of Christendom everywhere, and there was no single township of any nation in Christendom where the tendencies of this did not in some degree enter. For one, he believed that the Roman Catholic Church and the Greek Church would stand until the work which God had given them to do was done. But he felt bound, while recognizing all the good, to point out the dangers of the hierarchical, centralizing and traditional elements. These dangers were rife. Every one who studied the signs of the times fairly could see that there was—and he used the word purposely—a plot going on—a plot of the priests and of the rulers to keep down mankind by leaden weights, and to make them bond-slaves in spirit and in body. Was the world to go back once more to the sway of Rome? Was it to pass under the control of the Byzantine Church, with its head, the Czar, supported by bayonets? No—no such future was before mankind. Let them then look at the opposite side. Fronting the hierarchy and the centralized power in the State stood the party of revolution, asserting the equal rights of all men, declaring that every human being was a sovereign under God for and in himself, responsible to no one under God. Was then the Christian church to be shattered to the ground by this party? Were all the usage and custom which surrounded Christian institutions to be pronounced a despotism, and to be cleared away? Was the beautiful and blessed form of God's beloved Son, which seemed to be transparent with the divine light shining through it, to be eclipsed and to pass away into darkness, and was each human being to be thrown upon his own soul as his own Christ? Was the world to be given up to the bloody struggle between the hierarchy and the revolution? He did not believe that such a future awaited mankind. He then proceeded to consider how the future was to be avoided, and what were the great hopes and realities presented, if they would but open their minds and hearts to receive them, presented like God's messengers, to soothe, elevate and enlarge, and to assure mankind that God was ready to lead them if they would but yield themselves to His guidance. The preacher then proceeded to enlarge upon the great leading realities which he declared presented themselves in the doctrine of Christendom and the life of Jesus Christ. These principal realities were, that every human soul was designed to be in its degree a form of God—the unity of each human being with God and with the mortal race—and that death was no separation from the race, but that the race beyond the earth were in union with our race here. These realities were sufficient to assure them that Christendom would not sink under the control of the hierarchy, that it would not be overwhelmed by revolution, and that it would not stand halfway, trembling between fear and hope. These were realities which were to shape themselves into theologies which would be adequate to the ever-unfolding reason of man. These were realities which would organize themselves into institutions of Church and State, not destructive of the past, but using the past as a shield for the growing bud, which it should gradually put aside to unfold in all its beauty. One word he should say in conclusion, in regard to the position of the Unitarian body. They were Unitarians—they had the glorious name which represented the unity of man. Let them hold that name dear as a birthright. If once they asserted the unity of God, then logically they had asserted the unity of the church. If once they asserted the unity of the church, then they had asserted the unity of development through all ages. If once they asserted that unity of past and present, then they had declared that there was a unity, the principle and the law of which was love, and the manifestation of which must be love. Oh, such was the mission to which the Unitarian body was called—the latest born of Christianity, the heir and legatee of all that came down from the thoughts and aspirations of the ages—the little child upon whom the saints and sages of the past had put their hands in benediction. Should it not go forth to possess, and to glory in its trust? Aye, but if from want of earnestness, energy and confidence in God, that body did not do so, some other body, honoured by God, and worthy to do His work, would teach the unity of the Christian church, and of Christendom. It was given to that body to do if they would do it.

Let them seek for a perfect oneness in connection with the church of the Continent of Europe and the United States. Each individual congregation, and all congregations, should be linked together more closely. They had in this country a type of a national church. That type was a promise of something held out which should become a reality. They all recognized that that national church, avowing and declaring itself as such, was not adequate to the life of Christian love poured abroad throughout the nation. They could not in conscience yield themselves to its limitations. They must, out of the spirit of affinity, and of deep and reverent affiliation, like their ancestors, go forth to enlarge its boundaries. But there were two modes. One was the mode of life, and the other was that of death. One was that of declaring that there was no reality in it—the other was by saying that in its essence there was reality, and by holding firm to what was good in principle. The Unitarian body might do a work which should be recognized in every age as a work of blessed reformation. If they did not do it, some others would. That work was, to stand firm as the announcers of a larger, better, truer age of Christian faith, hope and love, and to declare that however others may stand divided from the Unitarian body, that body would be in unity with them, and so help to raise the temple of God, silent and unseen, through the ministry of their mediation. Let them stand firm and be faithful—unite themselves strongly and lovingly together in single congregations. Let them change their habits, he besought of them, in one respect—in regard to the isolation of their congregations, and let them bring the body of Unitarians into one living earnest communion—place themselves in fraternal relations with the congregations of the Continent and of the United States—place themselves, above all, in the hands of God. He had given them a providential work which it was for them to do, and may His blessing be upon them! The sermon lasted an hour and ten minutes, and was listened to with the closest attention, and evidently made a very deep impression on the assembly.

At the close of the religious service the meeting for business was formed, the chair being taken by Rev. William Gaskell, the senior pastor of the Cross-Street congregation. It was regretted that a very small portion of the congregation remained. Except from Liverpool, but few of the laity were present. In the absence (through indisposition) of the excellent Secretary, Rev. James Whitehead, the minutes of the last meeting were read and the roll was called over by the Rev. Mr. Wright. Thirty-one ministers of the two counties answered to the call.

Rev. R. Brook Aspland proposed the thanks of the assembly to the preacher. The ministers of the two counties had looked forward to that day with high expectations; those expectations had been more than fulfilled in the delight with which they had listened to the appointed preacher. That gifted man bore the honoured name of Channing. The honour in which that name was held was not confined to that assembly, but extended to all men of a truly catholic spirit throughout Protestant Christendom. After briefly characterizing the discourse to which they had listened, the speaker said that at their last assembly Mr. Channing had told them he was a descendant from Francis Higginson, the Puritan exile and one of the early preachers to the Pilgrim Fathers. The spirit of his ancestor burnt in the heart of his descendant. As he (Mr. Aspland) had listened to the fine catholic utterances of the preacher, his thoughts had been led to a pleasing incident in the life of Francis Higginson. When the shores of his native land (from which he was driven by the tyranny of Laud) were receding from his view, as he stood on the deck of the good ship *Talbot*, he exclaimed, with tender emotion, "I will not say, as some of the Separatists have said, 'Farewell, Babylon!' 'Farewell, Rome!' but I will say, 'Farewell, *dear* England! farewell, all the churches of Christ in England! farewell, all the members of every Christian church in England!'" Amongst many qualities in the sermon to which they had listened which deserved their praise, not one was more remarkable than its expansive, catholic spirit. In moving the thanks of the assembly to Mr. Channing for his sermon, he begged to add the request that it might be given to them through the press.—The motion was seconded by Rev. Dr. Beard.—In putting the motion, the Chairman said that in the outset Mr. Channing had told them he should say some things to which their judgments would not assent. Now he must say that he had not discovered these points of divergence. His admiration had, if they existed, laid his

judgment to sleep. There was nothing in the sermon to which he believed he could not give his assent. As to the request added to the vote of thanks, there was no one present who would not be grateful for the opportunity of reading that which had been heard with so much pleasure.—In acknowledging the vote, Mr. Channing said he had no excuse for declining the request of the assembly. He would take the opportunity of adding to the statements in his sermon an expression of the great worth of the congregational element in the Christian church. Their experience in America had brought out this. When the Pilgrims first landed, their thought, their scheme, was that every township or parish should have one church, and that all the separate assemblies should be but branches of one common Puritan church. The idea was found not practicable. Soon differences arose among the Pilgrims. First came the outbreak of Quakerism, and the persecutions to which its supporters were exposed. Antagonism of other kinds presently grew up, which broke up their original combination, and destroyed their unity as a national church. In Great Britain, with the type of a national church still standing, they occupied a different position from that in America. Unitarians in England had a special work left them to perform. The two terms (the congregational and the national) were not necessarily in antagonism. Without the free action of individual religious assemblies, no national church could attain its highest stature and greatest strength. It was his earnest wish that the Unitarian church of England might fulfil its great duty, and, while true to its individual convictions, might prove itself a branch of the church catholic.

The Chairman said they could seldom hold one of these annual meetings without being painfully reminded of the gaps which time was making in their circle. They had to lament losses by sickness as well as death, which would be fitly brought before their notice by some of his brethren.—Rev. F. Bishop said that the duty which he rose to discharge was one best executed almost in silence. Their meetings, encouraging and cheerful as for the most part they were, were often toned down by the reflection that some who had added to the pleasantness and usefulness of their gatherings would meet them no more. The late Rev. James Malcolm, who had been removed since their last assembly, was a man personally most amiable, and most anxious to discharge well his ministerial duties. Of this there was evidence in the impression he had left in the several congregations he had served in this county. At Billingshurst, Boston and Chester, his memory was tenderly cherished. The flock at Chester, when suddenly deprived of the minister to whom they were so sincerely attached, felt, he knew, an agony of grief. Mr. Bishop concluded by proposing a resolution expressive of the sympathy of the assembly with the family of Mr. Malcolm. It was seconded by Rev. J. P. Ham, and unanimously adopted.—At a subsequent part of the day's proceedings, a letter was read from Mr. E. Johnson, of Chester, enclosing a resolution passed by the congregation of that city, expressive of their gratitude for the kind and liberal services of the ministers who have gratuitously supplied the pulpit for six months in order to facilitate the arrangements making for the benefit of the family of their late esteemed and deeply lamented minister.

Rev. Franklin Baker said he rose with mingled emotions to propose a vote of sympathy with a gentleman who ranked with the oldest ministers of their assembly, the Rev. Charles Wallace, late minister of Hale and Altringham. For nearly forty years had he been connected with these two congregations. During all that period, he believed Mr. Wallace had been accustomed to attend their meetings and to enlighten them by his counsel. Were he (Mr. Baker) to follow the promptings of a long and valued friendship, he could say much on the subject of the soundness of Mr. Wallace's judgment, the vigour of his intellectual powers, and the purity of his moral feelings. It was his earnest hope that Mr. Wallace might be sufficiently restored to enable him to re-appear amongst the brethren who so greatly valued him.—Rev. Joseph Ashton, in seconding the vote of sympathy and respect, said his personal friendship with Mr. Wallace had been one of the greatest satisfactions of his life. He was a man of very superior powers of mind, gifted with talents equally strong and fine, and with dispositions and a character the full worth of which only his most intimate friends could appreciate. He seconded the resolution, while he deeply deplored the necessity which occasioned it.—The resolution was then unanimously adopted.

The Chairman then said it was his more gratifying duty to welcome some new-comers to the province. The first to whom he offered a fraternal welcome was Rev. Goodwin Barmby, now the minister of Lancaster, with whom, long before he knew him personally or as a brother minister, he had been united as a joint contributor to a periodical of general literature. The second was the Rev. John Gilbert, of Rivington. That gentleman had formerly belonged to a section of the "orthodox" church, and had been induced, after long and anxious thought, to join the Unitarian ranks. He (the Chairman) trusted that he would find amongst them that freedom which elsewhere had been denied him. The third to whom he offered, in the name of the assembly, the right hand of friendship, was a former pupil of his own, to whose worth he could speak with perfect confidence, Rev. J. J. Bishop, of Blackley.

Mr. Ainsworth being called on handed in the following letter:

Rev. Sirs,—I beg to thank you for the excellent arrangements made by you for supplying ministers for the religious services at Cleator during the past year. I have also to beg the ministers who, at inconvenience to themselves, so efficiently performed the duties entrusted to them, to accept this expression of my gratitude.

The attendance at these services has now become so large, that it will be necessary to increase the accommodation; and what was a few years ago almost a private meeting, has now become a public one of importance and great influence in the district.

It is absolutely necessary that these services should be continued, and I have therefore to request you to make provision for their celebration as in former years, and have only to regret that the amount I am able to place at their disposal as a pecuniary acknowledgment, is so much below the estimate I have of their deserts.

I am, Rev. Sirs, respectfully yours,

THOMAS AINSWORTH.

Cleator, June 18, 1856.

Rev. James Martineau moved that the supply of the Cleator services be referred to a Committee, consisting of Rev. Joseph Ashton, Rev. F. Baker and Rev. Henry Green.—Mr. Ainsworth bore testimony to the excellent arrangements hitherto made by the Committee. There had not been one misunderstanding, one fault, in them from first to last.

It will be remembered that Mr. Martineau had moved and carried at the meeting of the assembly in 1855, at Liverpool, a resolution to this effect:

That lapse of time and uncertainty of usage have rendered the constitution of the Association in some important respects indeterminate, and in particular the right of voting at its meetings is limited by no acknowledged rule or clear definition. That it is desirable so to define the constitution of this Association as to render it the organ of expression, in affairs of common interest, not to the ministers only who are convened to its meetings by circular, but to their congregations also. That a Committee be appointed to prepare a plan by which this object may be realized, and all inconvenient doubt respecting the limits of membership may be removed, and to report their proposals to the meeting next year.

Mr. R. D. Darbishire, as Chairman of that Special Committee, appeared and presented the report, which was couched in these terms:

That with a view to render the Provincial Association a fit organ for expressing the sentiments on matters of common interest at once of the ministers summoned to it and of their congregations, it is expedient to recognize as members entitled to speak at each meeting all the ministers and laymen of their congregations who may be present, but to limit the voting to the following persons: 1. The ministers of all congregations in Lancashire and Cheshire hitherto recognized as belonging to the Association, together with the ministers of any congregations that have been, or hereafter may be, admitted by the vote of an annual meeting into like connection. 2. The lay representatives, not exceeding three for each congregation, accredited to vote at the meetings of the Association.

That prior to the meeting of each year, a circular be addressed by the Secretary, not only to each of the ministers, but to one of the last year's representatives of each congregation, requesting that persons be duly elected and accredited to the ensuing meeting as lay representatives from such congregation. That in order to effect the first appointment of lay representatives, the circular be addressed to the minister of each congregation.

Mr. Holbrook Gaskell, in moving the adoption of the report, said that he did not anticipate any objection to it, seeing that it was of a practical character, and designed to meet a practical difficulty experienced by all who had attended this meeting. The Committee did not contemplate the alteration of

the functional character of the assembly. If these Provincial meetings were held for the purpose of attending a religious service, then of dining together and separating, they might go on in the chance-medley kind of style; but if they aspired to turn their meetings to a more important account, if they wished to gather from them the feeling of the Unitarian body generally, or if they wished to give expression to their feelings as a religious body, it was desirable that some provision should be made for ascertaining the views of the meeting. I presume, early in the history of this Presbyterian assembly, it was the custom to confine the right of voting to the ministers then present. I presume none others were then supposed to be present. So long as that was the case, all the congregations were on an equal footing when the ministers voted on matters interesting to the body; but when laymen began to form an integral part of the meeting, things were changed. The greatest number of laymen would of course be from the neighbourhood where the Provincial meeting was held. It might happen that the local attendance of laymen would exceed all the combined representatives of the more distant congregations. Then it would be manifestly unfair that the opinions of the representatives of the place should be held to express those of the body at large. To meet this evil, it had been proposed that the representative principle should be adopted, and that every congregation should have the right of delegating three persons to represent them at each meeting, and that voting should be limited to the representatives so appointed. He did not foresee any objection to this as a matter of principle, nor as a practical measure could he anticipate that it would experience much opposition. It might perhaps be objected that, if every congregation in the two counties sent its full complement of representatives, the assembly would become inconveniently large as a deliberative body. It might also be objected that possibly, in that case, the lay element would be out of proportion to the ministerial. But the smaller congregations might perhaps be content to send but one representative. The larger congregations, too, might complain that their interests were not sufficiently regarded in being put on a level with the smaller societies —Cross Street, for instance, with the small congregation at Warrington, with which he was connected. In such a case, the smaller congregation might be satisfied with a smaller representation. These, however, were mere matters of detail which might be easily met and amended. The Committee thought it best to recognize the representative principle in its simplest form. He wished to direct the attention of the assembly to the second clause of the report, which recognized the right of all parties in the two counties to attend and take part in the discussions. Hitherto there had been great doubt as to the composition of the assembly. If the report were adopted, the doubt would be removed, and for the future every gentleman would feel himself at liberty to attend. For his own part, supposing he found himself in such an assembly, he should be content if he had the privilege of giving utterance to his views, and should feel perfectly satisfied to leave the matter under discussion in the hands of the representatives of his own congregation. Anticipating no difference of opinion on the subject, he moved the adoption of the report.

Rev. John Robberds, in seconding the resolution, said he thought if the plan were adopted, it would give greater distinctness and importance to their meetings. The exclusiveness would probably lead to this, as it was in human nature to value a privilege where it was exclusive.

Mr. Ivie Mackie, while warmly approving of the other features of the plan, thought it would be somewhat too strong a measure to send three laymen to one minister. He would rather see the practice of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland followed, where only one elder attended each minister sent to the assembly.

The Chairman said there seemed to be in some quarters a mistake as to the feelings and wishes of the ministers. It was said that three to one would be unfair, and remarks were made as if the interests of the ministers needed special protection. So far from dreading the attendance of laymen and their equal participation in the privileges of the assembly, he would gladly welcome all the members of their congregations; in short, he would leave the constitution of the assembly just as it was.

Rev. Joseph Ashton said, although the new constitution had been described at Liverpool when the Committee was moved for, it had by no means come

before the congregations of the two counties for their consideration. Might it not therefore be proper to have the subject postponed, and discussed and decided another year?

Mr. John Grundy said that he had attended to the remarks of the gentleman who moved the adoption of the report, and he could not, especially as a chapel-warden, help feeling that it would be a difficult matter and an invidious distinction to ask some two or three of a large congregation to come forward and to reject others. Nor could he approve of the giving to all congregations, without regard to numbers and importance, the same number of representatives; to class places like Rivington, Chorley and Macclesfield, in the same list with Liverpool, Manchester and Dukinfield.

Rev. Franklin Baker inquired whether it was intended to give any compulsory power to enforce the appearance of delegates. If powers of that kind were not taken, he believed that the scheme would soon prove a dead letter. If they sought powers to fine and censure such as did not appear, he, old Presbyterian as he was, would resist such a proceeding. He was anxious to include all the laity in their proceedings. If it were generally understood that the laity had as much right in their meetings as themselves, he believed the attendance would soon be greatly increased.

Rev. Henry Green wished to correct the error of the mover of the report in respect to the laity. He believed that they had from the first taken part in the proceedings. He had recently met with a proof that, in 1735, Sir Charles Dukinfield had proposed a resolution at the Provincial assembly, which proved the right and the habit of the laity.—Of the remainder of the discussion we regret that our exhausted space prevents our giving even an outline. The plan was warmly and ably defended by Rev. Jas. Martineau, Mr. Henry Bright, Mr. Melly, Mr. Avison, Mr. Bolton, Mr. Chas. Rawlins and others, and objected to by Mr. Thos. Grundy, Rev. R. B. Aspland, Rev. Dr. Beard and Rev. Charles Beard. At the close of the discussion, Mr. Holbrook Gaskell replied very smartly to all the objections of previous speakers. A division took place, and the adoption of the report was carried by 33 to 25, several persons not voting on either side.

The next place of meeting was appointed to be Stand, when Rev. T. E. Poynting will be the preacher, and, on a ballot, Rev. J. P. Ham was elected supporter. After a vote of thanks to the Chairman for his services, and to the ministers and trustees of Cross-Street chapel for the use of the chapel, the meeting separated, having sat, including the religious service, about five hours.

The dinner took place at the Albion Hotel, and was attended by nearly 100 ministers and gentlemen. The chair was most ably filled by Mr. R. N. Philips, the High Sheriff, supported by Mr. J. A. Turner, Mr. Mark Philips, Mr. Meade King, &c. &c. Never was the speaking throughout the evening more animated or interesting.

On the following day, the ministers assembled to transact the business of the *Widows' Fund*. The report, presented by the respected Treasurer, Mr. Robert Heywood, was of a very cheering kind. The property of the Widows' Fund is estimated at £8761, and of the Auxiliary (Benevolent Fund), £1894, and both are yearly increasing in amount. It was stated that, during a period of about ten years, the property of these funds had increased about 50 per cent. The absence of the Secretary was much regretted, and the most cordial wishes were expressed for his speedy convalescence. In the afternoon of Friday the weather cleared up, and the friends enjoyed a garden soirée in the house and beautiful grounds of Mr. J. A. Turner. A numerous brass band was in attendance and played a variety of airs. Not the least remarkable feature of interest in the meeting was the attendance of the venerable uncle of the host, Rev. William Turner, now in the 94th year of his age. Thus closed one of the most successful and pleasant meetings of the Provincial assembly ever within our memory held.

---

### UNIVERSITY REFORM.

On Friday, the 20th June, 1856, the Cambridge University Bill was considered in the House of Commons, after having passed through the Committee of the whole House. Two amendments on the original Bill were on this occasion carried, which are especially interesting to the friends of religious liberty.

Each of the colleges at Cambridge possesses a number of scholarships, of the value of about £40 or £50 per annum each, for the assistance of undergraduate students during the pe-

riod of their academical education. All these scholarships, with other exhibitions for the benefit of undergraduates, were proposed to be open, without the necessity of any oath or declaration whatever.

Lord Palmerston gave his hearty assent to the clause moved by Mr. Heywood, M.P., for the opening of college scholarships and exhibitions at Cambridge, and the clause passed in the House of Commons by a large majority.

The Government had originally intended in the Cambridge University Bill, that all secular degrees should be open at Cambridge, but that a Church-of-England test should be imposed for admission into the senate, or University corporation, which possesses the privilege of returning two Members to Parliament; and that a similar Church-of-England test should be imposed on any office for which a Cambridge degree was a qualification, such, for instance, as a Professorship in the University, or a Mastership of an endowed grammar-school in the country.

Mr. Heywood divided the House of Commons on an amendment, by which the holder of a degree of suitable academical standing would be entitled to become a member of the academical senate, and to vote in the election of the Parliamentary representatives of the University of Cambridge, without either signing the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, or the three Articles of the 36th Canon relating to the spiritual supremacy of the Sovereign, the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles, which form the existing tests limiting the elective franchise in that ancient seat of learning.

On the question of the removal of tests from admission into the academical senate, Lord Palmerston and his Cabinet in the House of Commons voted against the concession under consideration, but the members generally of the Government were allowed to consider the subject open with respect to their votes, and the Attorney-General, Sir Alexander Cockburn, registered his vote in the majority of the House then present, for the removal of tests from admission into the senate of the University.

To explain the position in which a Dissenting Master of Arts would be placed without this amendment, it may be mentioned, that when the Baron de Rothschild, M.P., visits the House of Commons, his seat is on the bench set apart for distinguished strangers near the door of the House, but he is not allowed to pass the bar of the House, and to sit on the benches appropriated for Members of Parliament. A Dissenting Master of Arts would be, under the Bill in its original state, in a precisely similar situation in the Cambridge Senate-house.

Some demonstration of public feeling on the subject of the opening of Cambridge scholarships and of the Cambridge senate is much to be desired at the present time, that the House of Lords may be aware of the earnestness of popular opinion in favour of religious liberty. Petitions to the Right Hon. the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in favour of the opening of scholarships and the senate at Cambridge, will also be particularly valuable at this crisis.

---

ANNUAL EXAMINATION OF MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

The examination began at an early hour on Monday, June 23. The attendance during the day was never large. The gentlemen present during the day, some of them the whole day, others during one or more of the classes and sermons, were Rev. John Kenrick (Visitor), Mr. H. C. Robinson, Mr. James Yates, Mr. Thomas Ainsworth and two sons, Mr. Eddowes Bowman, Mr. James Coppock, Mr. J. C. Lawrence, Mr. R. Hutton, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Williams and Mr. Jones, and the following ministers—Revds. Thomas Madge, Edward Tagart, R. B. Aspland, Philip Le Breton, Dr. Sadler and T. L. Marshall. The Principal and Professors were also present. The Principal began the examination with his junior and middle class in Ecclesiastical History, including the first five centuries. The class consisted of Mr. Drummond, Mr. Blazeby, Mr. Holland and Mr. Gibson. The Principal stated that the students had been encouraged to read widely for themselves, and the answers given, particularly those of Mr. Drummond, often embodied the results of their private study. The answers, previously prepared in writing without the aid of books or notes, were read; they were very full and generally accurate. The second class, the junior Hebrew, consisting of Mr. Gibson and Mr. Mitchell, was examined by the Rev. G. V. Smith, the Professor of Theology. As the students had but recently begun the study of the language, their reading had been limited to a few chapters in

Genesis. They were examined in one chapter of this book, and exhibited a very respectable acquaintance with the passages read and the grammatical forms and construction of the words. Mr. Bowman then examined the senior Greek and Latin class, consisting of Mr. Upton, Mr. Dare and Mr. Bakewell. The Committee felt great satisfaction in being able, on the retirement of Mr. Adyes Scott, to secure the services of Mr. Bowman as Classical examiner. In Greek, the class had been engaged in reading the Œdipus Tyrannus of Sophocles and book vii. of Thucydides, the work prescribed by the University of London for the examination for the B.A. degree. In Latin, the class had read a portion of Cicero's Tusculan Disputations, one book of Lucretius, the three books of Livy prescribed for the B.A. examination, two books of the Annals of Tacitus, the Aulularia and Captivi of Plautus, the Odes of Horace, books i. and ii., Cicero's Letters to Atticus, books i. and ii. The examination was taken in Thucydides and Livy. The examiner remarked on the difficulty of framing, in the narrow limits assigned to him, an examination that should be at the same time stringent yet just to the students, where the examiner was not personally acquainted with the instructions actually given to the class.—Rev. G. V. Smith examined the class in Evidences, consisting of Mr. Gibson, Mr. Holland and Mr. Blazeby. The questions extended over a wide surface, and were answered with considerable ability, some of the replies evincing the opinions of the individual student, rather than reflecting the instruction of the Professor. Then followed a sermon by Mr. Holland, from Gal. vi. 10. After a brief interval, devoted to luncheon, the examination was resumed in the afternoon by Mr. Richard Hutton, with the junior and matriculation class in Mathematics, consisting of Mr. Heaviside, Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Bakewell. The pupils have attended the Mathematical class in University College of Professor De Morgan. The valuable services of Mr. Hutton have been continued during the session, to test by periodical examinations the progress and attainments of the students. The only other class examined on Monday was a supplementary class in Ecclesiastical History, in order to give the students an opportunity of reading with the Principal a Greek or Latin Christian author, and also a Heathen contemporary author. In addition to the valuable light thrown by it on the ecclesiastical history of the period, the work of this class keeps up with the graduates the habitual study of the classical languages. The Christian author selected was Arnobius. Passages were well translated and explained, and the history of the author and his times elucidated. The work of the day concluded with a sermon, read by Mr. Blazeby, from Psalm xxxv. 13.

On Tuesday, June 24th, the examination was resumed at an early hour in the presence of some of the gentlemen already named. The Rev. W. H. Channing, who came at the special request of the Committee, was present during nearly the whole of the remaining part of the examination, and evidently took deep interest in the proceedings. There were also present, during portions of the second day, Mr. Mark Philips, Mr. T. F. Gibson, Rev. J. H. Ryland, Rev. John Owen, Rev. Henry Solly and Rev. Hugh Hutton. Rev. G. V. Smith began the work of the day with the middle Hebrew class, which had been engaged in reading the latter part of the book of Genesis and a portion of the Psalms. It had not been the aim to get through so much reading, as to master the niceties of the language. The examination was in the Psalms, and was upon the whole very satisfactory. The Principal then examined the junior and middle class in Doctrinal and Practical Theology. The result was highly satisfactory, a very extensive question-paper having been answered with extraordinary fulness and general accuracy. Mr. R. Hutton next examined the senior class in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, and the result was satisfactory. The Principal followed with the senior class in Doctrinal and Practical Theology, and the answers were most creditable to the students, evincing careful reading for themselves, as well as proper attention to the invaluable lectures of their Professor. The laborious morning's work was brought to a close by a sermon from Mr. Gibson on Col. iii. 3. After the usual brief interval, Mr. Martineau took the class of Mental Philosophy, and the answers read by the students were generally marked with accurate knowledge of the difficult subjects treated by the Professor. Rev. G. V. Smith next examined the class in the Greek of the New Testament. He stated that the class had been conducted in two divisions. There

had been a written examination. The Prize offered by the late J. B. Yates, Esq., to the greatest proficient in the class, had been continued by his executors. Three of the students in the class had requested that, though attending the class, they might not be regarded as competitors for the Prize. It was after full consideration his conviction that, amongst the competitors, a decided superiority attached to the answers of Mr. Edwin Smith, and accordingly to him the Prize was awarded. A very good examination was taken in four of the Epistles of St. Paul. The Principal then examined the supplementary class of Ecclesiastical History in Plutarch, the heathen author selected for perusal this session as a companion writer to Arnobius. The duties of the day were brought to a close by Mr. Drummond, who read a sermon from Luke iv. 32.

On Wednesday, June 25, Mr. Bowman began with examining the junior class in Greek and Latin. In Greek, the class had read with Professor Malden, in the Greek class of the University College, the two Olynthiacs of Demosthenes, Homer's Iliad, book vi., and a portion of the Antigone of Sophocles. In Latin, they had read with Professor Newman, Horace, two books of Odes and part of the Satires, also the Jugurtha of Sallust, prescribed by the University of London for the Matriculation examination, the Æneid, books vii. and viii., and part of the De Officiis of Cicero. The examination was taken in Homer and Sallust, and indicated a less satisfactory amount of classical attainment than the Trustees have hitherto had the satisfaction of noting in the students of Manchester New College.—Rev. G. V. Smith next took the senior Hebrew class. The class had read during the session a portion of the first book of Samuel, some chapters in Proverbs and Job, the books of Joel and Nahum, the latter portion of Isaiah, and a portion of the Psalms. The examination was taken in the work which the class had been reading since Whitsuntide, and was good. Mr. Martineau followed with the class in Logic. The instructions of the class had been especially adapted to their preparation for the B.A. degree. Feeling that it was desirable for the class to acquire accurate knowledge of the ideas and language of Aristotle, he had read with them a selection from the writings on Logic by that author, arranged in progressive order. It had therefore been a class for reading rather than a lecture class. In one respect he was compelled to express his disappointment. Some members of the class had but an imperfect command over the Greek in which the text of Aristotle was written, and even over the Latin in which the notes of the German editor were written. This was the first experiment he had made of a class of this kind. It was due to others of the class to say that their answers had been uniformly satisfactory. At the close of the examination of this class, Mr. Whitehead read a sermon from Ecclesiastes v. 4. There was, as before, a brief interval for refreshment. The afternoon's proceedings were begun by Rev. G. V. Smith with the Criticism and Interpretation of the Old Testament, and the answers to the questions read were very creditable. The Principal then took the senior class in Ecclesiastical History. The questions ranged over five centuries, from the seventh to the eleventh, and were answered in great detail and with remarkable accuracy. This was the last class examined. Mr. Edwin Smith then gave a sermon, from Ephes. iv. 1—3, on the Duty of Forbearance.

If, in the faithful exercise of individual judgment, some notes of dissatisfaction have appeared, let us close our report with the expression of general satisfaction at the sermons read by the students. They were all serious and thoroughly religious, and some of them indicated skilful composition and mental power. There was, too, a marked improvement in the elocution of the young men. This is a satisfactory proof that the institution is successfully effecting its great object of preparing students for the duties of the pulpit.

A very numerous assemblage of friends, including both ladies and gentlemen, now filled the Hall. The Principal, after announcing the award to Mr. Edwin Smith of the Prize of books to the value of Five Guineas given by the executors of the late J. B. Yates, Esq., said that another Prize had been offered for the greatest proficiency in the knowledge of Latin, open to the students of the College and of University Hall. Mr. Upton and Mr. Dare were the competitors from the College, and Mr. Talfourd Ely from the Hall. Mr. Gibbs and himself had been the judges. The highest number of possible marks in their scale of merit was 810. The competition was very severe,

and the result might be expressed in these figures: Mr. Upton, 638 — Mr. Ely, 630—Mr. Dare, 525. The merits of Mr. Upton and Mr. Ely were found to be so nearly on a par, that it was resolved that the Prize should be divided, as it had in fact been last year, between these two gentlemen. The Principal requested the students to meet him in the Hall at 11 o'clock on the first Friday in October. He then introduced Rev. W. H. Channing to the assembled Trustees and friends, and that gentleman delivered a very brilliant address, which lasted about half an hour. It is out of our power to give this month even an outline of it. The interesting proceedings were then brought to a close by words of prayer uttered by Mr. Channing.

SERVICES AT THE OLD PRESBYTERIAN CHAPEL, HALL BANK, BUXTON, 1856.

July 6. Rev. George Lee, Kendal.
— 13. Rev. Brooke Herford, Sheffield.
— 20. Rev. John Shannon, Hull.
— 27. Rev. J. S. Gilbert, Rivington.
Aug. 3. Rev. Wm. Sutherland, Flagg.
— 10. Rev. Abram Lunn, Dobb Lane.
— 17. Rev. C. W. Robberds, Oldham.
— 24. Rev. James Bayley, Stockport.
— 31. Rev. J. G. Teggin, Gloucester.
Sept. 7. Rev. Wm. Smith, Rochdale.
— 14. Rev. M. A. Moon, Stannington.
— 21. Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A., Dukinfield.
— 28. Rev. John Jas. Bishop, B.A., Blackley.
Oct. 5. Rev. F. Baker, M.A., Bolton.

Morning service at eleven o'clock.
Evening service at half-past six.

# OBITUARY.

March 28, in London, aged 40, Ann, wife of Mr. J. R. Mott, of Moseley, near Birmingham. Unassuming in her manners and kind and gentle in her disposition, she was beloved by all who knew her. She was faithful in the discharge of all her duties as a wife and mother, and by her sorrowing husband and children her memory will ever be cherished with affectionate remembrance. During a long and severe illness, which was borne with meek submission to the Divine will, she enjoyed much of that "peace which the world can neither give nor take away." "Her witness is in heaven, and her record is on high" (Job xvi. 19).

April 16, Thomas Smith, of Spring Gardens, Gainsborough, aged 68 years. He was born at Riccall, near Selby, Yorkshire, and originally destined for agricultural pursuits; but the natural bent of his disposition diverted this intention of his parents and decided him to adopt the profession of an educator of youth. The strong literary bias which he early exhibited, commended him to the notice of the Rev. Joseph Nelson, the curate of his native parish, who materially assisted him in preparing for the office of an instructor, which he followed upwards of fifty years with credit to himself and profit to his pupils. He accepted early in life the situation of tutor in a private family near Malton. Thence he removed to that of teacher in a very large and flourishing school at Chester, the principal of which was an Hungarian of the name of Stolterforth, who visited England in the suite of the Turkish ambassador, and who settled in this country after the mission of that functionary was accomplished. From Chester, he was attracted to Biggleswade, in Bedfordshire, by his desire to acquire a knowledge of the French language and the opportunity of gratifying his wish which presented itself by forming an engagement, as Mathematical master, in the school of a Mons. Salmon. After remaining here sufficiently long to accomplish his purpose, he went to Nottingham as Mathematical assistant in the academy of the Rev. H. Tayler. It was during the two years spent in this capacity that the change was wrought in his religious convictions to which he ever afterwards adhered with unswerving consistency. Whilst with Mr. Tayler he became an Unitarian; and, although his profession of Unitarian sentiments frequently stood in the way of his preferment, he never hesitated between duty and interest, nor suffered the prospect of secular advancement to tempt him from the path of what he considered to be truth and righteousness. More than once in the course of his career he was disqualified as a candidate for the mastership of a public school simply on the ground of his heterodox opinions. Mr. Smith was not only distinguished for the integrity of his character, but also for the extent and variety of his attainments. At one period he devoted much of his time and attention to mathematics; and the Ladies' Diary and other similar publications attest the application and success with which he pursued

this branch of learning. During his manhood and declining years, he devoted himself more exclusively to the study of languages, in which he became no mean proficient; and his last illness overtook him in the midst of considerable progress in the acquisition of Arabic. He was to his latest day an ardent searcher of the Scriptures, especially in their original tongues; and his diligence in this direction was testified by the uncomplaining patience with which he bore the severe suffering of his last illness. He was elder brother of the late Rev. Richard Smith, of Lynn, and father of the Rev. W. Smith, of Rochdale. His mortal remains were interred in the cemetery of Morton, near Gainsborough.

---

June 1, at Kingsdown, Bristol, in the 21st year of her age, MARGARET FRANCES, only daughter and last surviving child of the late Robert RANKIN, Esq., formerly Chief Justice of Sierra Leone.

---

June 13, at Ashburnham Grove, Greenwich, FRANCES, relict of the late John Geere JONES, Esq., and sister of John Brent, Esq., alderman, Canterbury, in her 67th year.

---

June 14, at Portswood Lawn, Southampton, in her 81st year, SARAH, wife of John Hays DUNKIN, Esq. A long and painful illness was sustained by her with that unfaltering patience and resignation which rests only on the Christian faith that all is ordered by infinite wisdom and perfect goodness; and her words of deep affection to those whose privilege it was to tend her to the last, have left the sweet memories of a love which they hope to renew in that brighter world,

"Where man in his glory shall inherit
What is brightest and best of his earthly spirit."

One of her greatest sources of enjoyment through life had been a warm interest in all the stimulating and enlightened questions which affected the interest of humanity, especially in all those which concerned civil and religious liberty, and this interest continued in her in a very remarkable degree even to the period of her last severe illness.

On the resignation of her son-in-law, the Rev. Edmund Kell, she had removed from Newport to Southampton, where she quickly won the love and regard of the new circle of friends in which she was placed, and their many kindly attentions; and the visits of the little children with their baskets of flowers, often cheered the long, weary hours of her sick chamber. Thanks be to those whose sympathies brightened her declining days! Her remains rest in the beautiful Forest cemetery near Southampton.

---

June 19, at Bristol, aged 74, ANNA, widow of Rev. Lant CARPENTER, LL.D., after an illness of two months, borne with that Christian patience and submission to the will of her Heavenly Father which were the characteristics of her life.

She was the daughter of James and Budget Penn, of Kidderminster, and niece of the Rev. Timothy Laugher, who was minister of Hackney; and she inherited from her maternal ancestors superior mental endowments, as well as strong religious feelings and principles. After a youth of many trials, during which she and her sisters maintained themselves by tuition, she married Mr. Carpenter in 1805, and to the close of his life shared with him the labours of his school, and the pastoral duties of the congregations of George's meeting, Exeter, and Lewin's Mead, Bristol. When relieved in age from incessant duties, her former pupils and her many friends found her ready to cheer and help in every trouble and difficulty, to sympathize in every joy, and to give, when required, that judicious advice which she afforded from the experiences of a varied life faithfully noted and improved, and from a deep and influencing desire to learn and do the will of God. She was as a tree planted in the Lord's house which bore fruit in old age, and that fruit was ripened and mellowed in the soft autumnal days. Her character seemed not to lose force, but to be marked by increased serenity and beauty. Whilst retaining her habit of rigid self-denial, she had ampler means of gratifying those generous impulses which were both deep and wide. She loved the "household of faith," to which she had so many ties, and took an ardent interest in all that exemplified the spirit of Him who came to seek and save those who were lost. Her intellect was singularly free from prejudice, and her heart seemed always young. Her children rise up and call her blessed; and many beyond her own roof felt her "a mother in Israel." Her long life of humble and untiring self-sacrifice was closed without a struggle, and her spirit rejoined the loved ones, "not lost, but gone before."